

Concordia Discors:

OR, SOME

ANIMADVERSIONS

Upon a late Treatise;

ENTITULED,

An ESSAY for Catholick Communion.

IN A

LETTER

TO A

Friend at *Westminster*,

By a Presbyter of the Church of England.

L O N D O N :

Printed by George Sawbridge in Little
Britain 1705. Price 1 s.



Concordia Discors:

O R,

*Some Animadversions upon a
late Treatise, &c.*

My Good Friend!

I Thank you for your kind Letter, and good opinion of me, but not for your importunity, wherewith you press me to give you my plain thoughts of a late bold Author, who entitles his Book, *An Essay for Catholick Communion*. For to wash off all the varnish, wherewith he hath daub'd so many rotten Posts, and to detect the artificial Shams, whereby he hath exploded so many weighty Controversies; and then having rescued Truth out of the hands of a Religious Banterer, to set it in a true light, would furnish matter to fill a Folio, which I have neither strength nor leisure to write. I could therefore heartily wish, that you had singled out some abler Pen, and made choice of a Person, whose Name and Accomplishments might have answered other Men's expectations as well as your own; but though I might plead my declining

clining Age, infirmness of Body, and other reasonable excuses ; yet seeing you are so very urgent, and ply me upon the score of old Friendship, I will endeavour to assist you with some Opticks, wherewith you may be enabled to discern the *ugly face* of a *bad Cause*, through all the *thick Paint* and *fine Colours* laid upon it. The Author is a Man of Learning, Parts, Cunning, and certainly of more designs than one, which in my apprehension are none of the best, if any restraint of just *Liberty* have its tendency to *Slavery* ; yet considering the untoward temper of the generality of Mankind, surely we must confess, that *excess of liberty is the Mother of Extravagancy* ; of which perhaps we have had more experience, than we have made good use of. For the loose and luxuriant Wits of these licentious times, have stock'd us with such variety of Sects, and repugnant Opinions, that some, knowing not what to do with them, nor how to manage them, have thought it might be a wise course to enclose them all within a *Statute of Comprehension* ; and though others, who are sensible how apt these kind of Cattle are to break Pound, have thought this to be in its own nature impracticable, yet several projects have been set on foot for that purpose ; but to deal plainly with you, I think this Author hath far outdone them all. For put all together, both what he will allow you in your own practice, and what he will oblige you to tolerate in others, and yet continue in the same Communion, and I think scarce any error or wickedness

edness can be named, which at this rate may not become a *free denizen* of the *Christian Church*; for why, provided it be not *Commanded*, it is not a rash matter what is *Practised*. They that will have a *Maypole*, shall have a *Maypole*; and they that will not have a *Maypole*, shall not have a *Maypole*; but Neighbours! what hindrance is this, but that we may all of us well enough agree to dance round the *Maypole*? But (which is worse) one Man thinks it unlawful to *worship Images*, he then shall be a very *honest good Man*, and shall not be oblig'd to *worship Images*; another is for the *Worship of Images*. Why, he shall be *tolerably good too*, and shall be suffered to *worship Images*, provided that all concur in the *same Communion*. Where can you find out a fitter *Advocate* and *Patron* for *Libertinisme* and *Licentiousness*?

Men of ill designs stand most in need of all others, to cover them with fair and alluring pretences; but not to enquire at present after our Author's intention, or the real design he drives at, it must be acknowledged, that his pretence is not only fair, but great and glorious: The *Unity of the Church* is what he would persuade us he aims at; and though the Means he prescribes for attaining it be never so incongruous, yet nothing is more desirable than the thing itself, nothing more comfortable, nothing more advantagious; if there were such an unity as ought to be, instead of thinking it doing God good service to take away innocent Lives, (which prophesy of our Saviour, I fear is too much fulfilled

fulfilled in our days) it would work quite contrary effects; it would cool our Heats, stifle our Animosities, heal our Breaches, end our Quarrels, every where produce Peace, and inflame Love; we should be tender of each others good, and do all we could to promote it; our Devotions would be performed cheerfully, and our greatest emulation would be, how to outstrip each other in Goodness, to be most zealous in God's Service, and most Charitable, Kind, and Assisting to each other; we should then every where find the same Faith, the same Friends, the same Communion, the same Brotherly Love and Kindness, and all the comforts, advantages and enjoyments which this World could afford, or our Hearts desire in it; and when the rest of the unbelieving World should behold this beauty of Holiness, and see such regular Devotion, such entire Love, and such sweet Harmony and Concord among Christians, how would they be able to withstand the allurements and force of it, but come thronging in to be made partakers of such a happy State; till the whole World should resound with the Praises of our God, and all acknowledge his Son Jesus Christ? This would bring down a sort of Heaven upon Earth; and thus it would be, if Christianity had its true effect upon the Hearts and Lives of the Professors of it. What excess of Madness then is it to abandon our own greatest Interest, by embroyling such an happy State? And how can he deserve the name of a Christian, who would not do all that he lawfully could to pro-

procure and promote it? He that would not do his part, let him be *Anathema Maranatha*.

It is certain this *Unity* would be best promoted and effected by a *Joint Communion*, of which we have a lovely Pattern in the first Primitive Christians; but, however, it comes to pass, it is quite otherwise; Christ's seamless Coat is rent into so many *Pieces*, that it is become *Rags*; and none are more furious and implacable Enemies to each other, than the greatest part of those, who call themselves Christians. To range over the World, and enquire after the several Causes of this dismal decay of Christianity would be an over-tedious undertaking: That which lyes before us is to examine the Cause, which our Author assigns as the obstacle of such a *Communion*, as might in a great measure procure this *Unity*. Now, though, it may be well done to begin at Home, and first sweep our own House; yet, they seem to deserve little credit with respect to others, who make small Conscience of falsely accusing themselves; whether he doth or not is to be tried; but this he peremptorily saith even of a Church, whereof he seems at least to profess himself a Member, *Is not this a great Blemish to our Church, that we are in Communion with no part of the Christian World? That we are separated from all? &c.* (p. 2.) here others will be apt to say, *babes reum conscientem*; but let the fault lye where it will, it is a heavy Charge; for if she be justifiable in such a Separation, it will argue the State of Christianity to be most

most desperately degenerated, so that there might even now be room for that saying of our Saviour ; *When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find Faith on the Earth?* (Luke 18. 8.) on the other hand if the fault be hers, and she unjustifiable in such a Separation, it will not only proclaim her the most haughty, insolent, obstinate Church on Earth, but seems to cut her off from the Catholick Church, and endanger the Salvation of all her Members ; but either way the case is bad enough, and therefore the truth of it ought to be enquired into.

The Church is either *Militant* or *Triumphant*, but both make up one *Body*, whereof *Christ* is the *Head*. With respect to the Church *Triumphant*, it is said, *our Ship Fellow*, in the Original it is κοινωνία, *our Communion is with the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ*, (1 John 1. 3.) and still more fully with respect to the whole Body of the glorified Saints it is said, *ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν ἑβρανοῖς ὑπάρχει* (Eph. 3. 20.) There is an Emphasis both in the word, πολίτευμα ὑπάρχει, which our Translation doth not, and perhaps cannot, fully reach ; and it doth signifie, that the nature of the Christian Society is such, that those on Earth have a real Incorporation, Communication, Connexion or Conjunction with those in Heaven, from whence appears our present right to that blessed State, and assurance that we shall hereafter enjoy it with them, and this is none of the least of our Comforts and Advantages in being Christians. Now I hope our Author will not say, that his Church

is

εὐ Phil:

is so nice and strait-lac'd as to her Communion, as to have no Communion with the Church of God in Heaven if he do, let his Church be what it will, I desire to have no Communion either with him or her.

As to the *Church Militant*, I think I may lay it down as an acknowledged Truth, That there is a duty incumbent on all Christians, and all Christian Churches on Earth to maintain the *same Faith*, and rule of *holy living*, and join in *communion* in the same, under *lawfully authoriz'd Pastors*; and that the Communion of each particular Church ought to be such, that they may own each others Communion to be Christian and lawful; and such, as when lawfully called there-to, they may lawfully join therein, so that all the particular Members belong to and make up that one Body, which derives its gracious Influences from Christ the Head. But still no particular Church is bound to *impossibilities*, nor to what is in it self *sinful*: If therefore any particular Church or Churches do seperate from others, or deny communion to others, the *Crime* will follow the *Cause*, and the guilty Party only in this case shall be answerable, and it shall nothing prejudice those, who professing the true Faith, and Rule of holy Living, extend their Christian Communion as far as they lawfully can, but that they shall still continue true Members of the Catholick Church: For if it were not thus, it would be in the Power of any particular Church upon any pique or humour by a seperation and denying Communion to others, to exclude all from the Catholick Church. It is not my present business to enquire into the grounds and reasons of Communion, tho'

it may in some measure hereafter. I am now to examine, whether there be any truth in this dreadful charge, which he hath drawn up against the Church of *England*. *That she is in Communion with no part of the Christian World, but seperated from all*. Now tho' he is very desirous, that the Church of *England* would either admit, or bear with much more than she doth; yet he is not very quarrellsome with her for what she doth hold; and consequently she must be acknowledged to own all Churches, so far as they retain the same *Faith* and *Doctrines* with her. But *Communion*, properly speaking, cannot be but with and under proper *Governours* for that purpose; now from the time that the Church was governed by an ordinary standing Power always to continue, upon the best search that I have been able to make into Antiquity, I can find no other *Communion* but *Episcopal*. As for *Metropolitan*, which was very early, and *Patriarchal Power*, which soon after arose, the *Communion* with them was *quatenus Bishops*. They had had nothing to do with the *Metropolitan* or *Patriarch* in this respect, if they had not been *Bishops*. But I never read or heard that the Church of *England* ever seperated from any one Church in the World, much less from all, *quatenus Episcopal*, but was ready as such to own and embrace them.

But that we may still come up more close to this Author, I would desire to know of him, what *Episcopal Churches* in the Christian World (those of the *Roman Communion* excepted, who have thrust us from them) the Church of *England* doth refuse, or is refused by them? Dr. *Baſter* acquaints us, that being forc'd to travel during

during that horrid Rebellion begun in 41, he was kindly received in the *Greek Churches*, freely admitted to their *Communion*, and moreover requested by them to *Preach* in their *Congregations*, and that he actually did so. It is not long since, that the Archbishop of *Philopopolis*, flying from *Turkish* Rage and Barbarity, came hither, and he constantly made his Application to the *Bishops* and *Churchmen*, his *conversation* was with them, and among them; what his *Communion* was here I cannot say, as being not at all privy to that Affair; but I have not heard of any thing but Love and Kindness that pass'd between them, which would hardly have been so great and steady, if either he had condemned their *Communion*, or they denied him *Communion*. If we may rely on the History written by *Ludolphus*, which hath been received with general applause, you may therein observe found remains of primitive Simplicity among the *Habassinian Christians*, which are scarce to be found elsewhere; and I know not what hinders, but that we might communicate with them, and they with us, if Opportunity did present; and without it we cannot. If the *Armenian* and *Russian Churches* are charged with gross Ignorance, it might be a good reason to pitty and succour them, but not to Excommunicate 'em. There are other Christian Churches of other Denominations, some of which lye under severer Imputations; but they being at vast distance, and their Cause related by others, not themselves, we pass no peremptory Sentence upon them, till it be tried, whether they can purge themselves; and, indeed, I cannot find, that there is any Church in the Christian

Some

World more modest and sparing of her Censures with respect to other Churches, than the Church of *England*; so little reason had our Author to make her, by a total seperation in effect, to condemn all.

But though I think this Gentleman hath done very ill to set the Church of *England* at defiance with all Churches in the Christian World; yet (if it could be lawfully and honestly done) I am so far from opposing what he pretends to be his design, which (as he saith) is *the enlarging her Communion, and restoring her to her primitive state*; (§. 3.) but when I consider the Methods whereby he would effect this, they seem to be very preposterous and unsuitable. For the great, and indeed the only thing he presseth to this purpose, is to *reconcile* us to the *Church of Rome*, and persuade us to join in *Communion* with it. Now as he is under a great mistake, if he thinks this would make our Communion Catholick; so I think it to be a very odd way of restoring the Church of *England* to her primitive State, by making her recede farther from it than she now is, in joining in Communion with the Church of *Rome*, which has in more Particulars degenerated from the primitive State than any Church whatsoever. But since this is proposed as the *πανακμαχον* to cure all our Diseases, That we be not put upon with *Mountebank Tricks*, it may be reasonable to examine it. And in the first place (setting aside, at present, the merits of the cause) it may be a proper and pertinent Enquiry, *what we shall get by it?* For at that very time that we *reconcile* to the Church of *Rome*, we must *fall out* with all the rest

(an Out.)

rest of the *Christian World*. When we enter her *Communion*, we shall be obliged to pronounce all *Christians* out of that *Communion* to be either *Hereticks* or *Schismatics*, or both, and to treat them as such. Now, beside the rashness and uncharitableness of such a Censure, this would be rather to straiten than enlarge our *Communion*. For Mr. *Brerwood* in his *Enquiries* hath made it appear, that the *Christians* and *Churches* out of that *Communion* are far more numerous, than those in it; and if we join with her, we become irreconcilable with all those, which being not the present case of the *Church of England*, she is much better as she is; and to lose all the rest of the *Christian World* for *Rome*, would make her not a *Gainer* but a *Loser*.

It is small encouragement to court the *Communion* of the *Church of Rome*, that we can get little or nothing by it: But there is another Question of greater moment, *viz:* *How we shall come by it, or by what means we may attain to it?* For if the difficulty be so great, that it is, either not at all to be had, or not upon tolerable Terms, we may spare our Courtship, and better employ our pains in matters of nearer concern to us. There is no doubt but Men of all Parties according as their Zeal, Abilities, and Opportunities serve; will be endeavouring to gain Proselytes, but such pickering on both sides, doth not reconcile Churches, but rather exasperate: And as for the reconciliation of the Churches at this time, considering the present State of affairs, I look upon it as a matter impossible: For most of the *Kingdoms* and *States* in *Europe* are engaged
in

afflicted
(a
pursued.
 in a *desperate and bloody War* ; and even those, who are not in it, are afflicted by it : So that there is no room now for such a Proposal, were it in self never so plausible : It will not be hearkned to ; The *Still Voice of Peace* is drowned with the roaring of *Cannon* and the noise of *Drums* and *Trumpets* ; and *Princes* make their advantage and interest of the different *Perfwasions* in Religion, to animate their *People* against each other, and enflame their courage. Besides, in the times of *War* and *Broils* all *Factions* lift up their heads, and not only expect *impunity*, but for the most part lay claim to and possess themselves of greater *privileges* ; and endeavour all that may be to strengthen and increase their *Parties* ; they lay hold on the Troubles of Governments as their *Opportunities* to advance themselves : and therefore to make such a motion as this at this time, were to tempt 'em to laugh you to scorn, or to fly in your face or to accuse you as a Betrayer of the State, and a Friend to your Country's Enemies, there must be peace among the *Civil Powers* before the peace of the *Churches* can be treated of to any purpose. And not only *Wars* must cease, but there must be an inclination to preserve Peace, and there must be another sort of disposition in the World, before things necessary in order to such a design can be brought to bear. Sovereign *Princes* and *States* of different *Perfwasions* must be in a condition and temper to permit proper Persons of their Subjects to meet in a General Council, or as General as may be ; convenient Place must be agreed on, and when this is done, we must take care to secure our
selves

selves from Tricks, and being præjudged, least
 we be served as the *Lutherans* were at the Coun-
 cil of *Trent*; and not be admitted as *Parties*
 but *Criminals*. Nor is it of the least moment,
 that it be determined, whether after Debate
 Suffrages shall be reckoned by *Nations* or *Single*
Persons; and many other things there are to
 be considered and Setled, which (howsoever
 desirable they may be in themselves) are now
 a long way off; and he that vainly fancies he
 can prevail and get over all these Circum-
 stances as the World now is, may as well em-
 ploy himself in preaching Peace to the Waves
 of the Sea in a Tempest: Yet I take this to be
 one of the least of our Author's Faults; for
 though an *unseasonable Proposal* often breaks
 the neck of a *commendable design*, yet it rather
 argues the *indiscretion* of the Person, than the
badness of the thing; and if there had not
 been much more to be said against it, the
 zeal of the Man would have easily atoned
 with me for the Mistiming his Project.

If only the Inclinations of Persons were the
 Bar in this Case, there might be hope; that
 Time might find a Remedy for it; but there
 are other Matters either Pre-requisites to that
 Communion or Obstacles, in the very nature
 of the thing, which seems to me insuperable,
 (because unsufferable) while that Church
 continues obstinately to adhere to whatever
 she holds, and depart from nothing. But to
 begin with what paves the way for Admissi-
 on; the first things, which present them-
 selves, are *Infallibility* and *Supremacy*, and he
 that can swallow these; had need have a wide
 Throat, and a strong Digestion. These mutual-
 ly

ly support each other. For he that is *infallible*, will in course be *Supreme*; and he that is *Supreme* in the Sense the *Romanists* generally apply it, will in effect be *infallible*; so that to grant either is to give both. There will be need of the plainest and strongest Evidence in the World, in this case; for if you allow *Infallibility*, at the first dash, you allow all beyond retrieve, all Points are given up, all Differences at an end. For what room can there be, for Reasoning or Debate, where *Infallibility* dictates? With what Face can any Man hesitate at any *Doctrine* or *Practice*, when he acknowledgeth it to be *Infallibility*, which says, it is, and must be so? You need be well assur'd in this case; for if it be no such thing, and your pretended *infallible Guide* should lead you the *broad way* instead of the *narrow*, and direct you to *Hell*, instead of *Heaven*, you are irrecoverably lost; for you must jog on without scruple. In other Cases you may consider with your self, or enquire of others, and so if you should chance to be out of the way, may get into it again: But here it is quite otherwise, *Infallibility* supercedes all other Endeavours; you have nothing to do to *think*, much less to *doubt*, or *ask* of others, but to go on securely without Fear or Wit, according to Direction, or as you are lead; and if you be mistaken, as to your *Infallibility*, and happen to be in the *wrong*, you must never be in the *right*. Seeing then that a Mistake in this Case is so dangerous and desperate, our Author may do as he lists, and be as careless of his Salvation as he pleaseth; but for my own part I shall expect better proof of this *Infallibility*.

lity, than ever I have yet seen, before I trust it; and so certainly will others who value their safety. And yet this they must be fully persuaded of, before they are fit for *Communion* with *Rome*.

But lest we should stick here, our Author very wisely makes minc'd Meat of his *Infallibility*, that it may go more glibly down. He is content to furnish his *Pope* only with a *so so Infallibility*; a certain *hocus pocus* sort of *Infallibility*, which is *Infallibility*, and not *Infallibility*. For thus he puts the Question, *whether the Pope be infallible in his Definitions, and Doctrines, so that all who are in Communion with him, are bound to receive, and believe them, as unquestionable Truths?* Yes surely, if he be truly *infallible*. But I would gladly know, what is the meaning of being *infallible*, and not *so infallible*? I do not well understand these *Degrees of Infallibility*. But not to trouble him with my shallowness, we will be content to take him in his own way; and then he undertakes to prove that the *Pope* is not judg'd to be *so infallible*. But how doth he prove this, why first he tells us, *That it is not mentioned in the Definition of the Council of Florence, &c. That it is not in the Formula of Faith, set forth by Pius 4th. &c. That it has no place either in their Catechism ad Parochos, nor in any other Catechism, &c.* Now all these being silent, you know *silence gives Consent*: But then may not *Silence* as well give *Consent*, that he is *so infallible*, as that he is *not so infallible*; and so either prove the quite contrary, or just nothing at all? But to make amends for this, and drive the Nail to the Head, he hath no less than

than twelve Universities, and the Lord knows how many famous Doctors, who some time or other have professedly written against this *so Infallibility of the Pope*: (P. 17, 18, 19,) as to all which I can freely grant him, that many in the *Roman Communion* have opposed this Doctrine, especially about the Times of the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*, and that the *Gallican Churches* generally receive it not, or not without great reluctancy at this time. But then I would ask him, whether as many other Doctors have not, and now do maintain it? Whether it do not get ground, and is become the prevailing Doctrine? Whether he, who is now safe out of reach, and unworthily (as betraying it) of another Communion, will be content to go into *Italy*, and there boldly and resolutely preach against the *Pope's* pretence to *Infallibility*? If he would, I am confident he might soon see an end of his Project, and experience the folly of it in a very upright death, with a pile of flaming Faggots about him.

Although I might, yet I am not willing to draw the Saw longer with him in this matter; we will give him his Argument: For he may very easily perswade me, that the *Pope* is not *infallible*, but then how Doth this mend the matter? For let the *Pope*, if you please, be no more than another Man, yet is there not some body or somewhat which we must acknowledge to be *Infallible*, if we be with them? I neither mean the *Deity*, nor the *Holy Scriptures*, the former of which we jointly own, and the *Infallibility* of the latter we are much more ready to acknowledge than they; for it is under the impious pretence of Supplying the

Insufficiency

Insufficiency of that, that they Substitute their *Infallibility*. It is therefore some *Man*, or *body of Men*, which they require us to Submit to as *Infallible*: For do not they own an *Infallibility* in the *Church*? And to make it worse do they not limit that *Infallibility* to the *Roman Church*? And do they not carry it into their *present Church*? Is not this the cry at this very Day at our own doors, in our own hearing, by all the *Roman Emiffaries*, who are busy in most places in making *Converts* among us? One is for an *Infallible Propounder*, and (which is the same in effect) another avers the *Church* (by which he means the present Church of Rome) to be the *only* Interpreter, and that both of *Scripture*, and their *Traditions* too: And without this they say, there can be no *certainty of Faith*, because without it Faith cannot be built upon grounds which are *Impossible to be false*; and with this they fright and gull weak People, as if Faith were no were else to be had, in order to which this *Infallibility* must be first admitted; So that the *Divine Revelations*, the *Holy Scriptures*, and all other helps in the World, can stand us in no stead, unless we take in the assistance of their *Infallible Interpreter*. This is the first, and great thing they insist on, with which they Scare People out of this, and other Churches; and yet these *deluded Wretches*, when caught, could never set their eyes on this *Infallible Gentleman*, or receive any *Instruction* or *Information* from him, unless every *Priest* be *Infallible*. For they still know no more, than what they are taught by them: But if you should be desirous to

have some *conversation* and *communication* with *Infallibility* it self, they cannot certainly direct you to it; for they are not yet agreed where to place it, and this, no doubt, wonderfully mends the matter, and strongly invites us over; for what shall we be the better for an *Infallibility* we can no where find? For if it be not to be found, how shall we make any use of it, or receive any benefit by it? And yet perhaps this is not without design, for if they would fix it in a certain Subject, then we might examine it, and discover the cheat of it; but whilst they shuffle it from one hand to another, instead of confuting it; we are lost in the search of it. In short, *God* is an *Infallible Propounder*; his *Holy word* an *Infallible Rule*; that *depositum* was committed to the Church, in which every particular Church hath as good a share and interest as the Church of *Rome*. If any Doubt arise, the concurrent Judgment of the Church throughout all Ages, is the best Interpreter and Decider of the Question; all Churches are safe, while they walk by the Rule which *God* hath given them; but no particular Church is *Infallible*: For if it were otherwise, not so many particular Churches could have failed as have done, tho' in their Original of Apostolical Institution, and as to the reception of the Faith precedent to the Church of *Rome*. I cannot therefore imagine what temptation it can be to any wise Man to go over to her *Communion*, when the first step he makes towards it must be to acknowledge her *Infallibility*. If we might treat as *Sister Churches*, or *fellow Christians*, there might be hope of *accomodation* in some time; but while She assumes

assumes to herself an *Infallibility*, and peremptorily *condemns* all other *Churches*, there seems not to be any place for Agreement. For there is no *treating* with *Infallibility*, but *yeilding* to it; and if you admit it, you must tamely swallow whatsoever afterwards she shall please to thrust down your throat, and in a matter of no less than eternal Salvation, certainly no considerate Man would be very easy, or yielding to Such a dangerous Pretence.

But besides this, there is another Gobbet as hard to swallow, and that is the *Supremacy*; and here the Question is not, whether the Pope shall have *right* done him, but whether we shall have no *wrong*? Or, indeed, whether we shall have any *Rights* left us, which (the Supremacy consider'd he lays claim to) may not be ravished away at pleasure? We are willing and ready to do him all *just right*; yea, perhaps, if the matter could be fairly stated and ascertained, we should not be unwilling, for *peace* sake, to recede from some of our *own rights*, provided that the *common faith* did not suffer, and our *Church* was not endangered. But then I think that with good reason we may require, that he should do us *right*, which can never be done, while he pertinaciously adheres to the *Supremacy* he claims; and therefore so long as he continues in this mind, we must crave his pardon, if we are unwilling to quit our *just rights*, that we may put our selves under such an *exorbitant power*, which will be to *injure* our selves, and to *encourage* and *Strengthen* him in his wicked and *unjust Usurpations*.

I know, that it is warmly disputed, how far this *Supremacy* extends it self. As for those, who

who would clip its Wings, tho' they are not able well to bear the *extravagancy* of it, yet they know not well where to fix the *bounds* of it; and this runs them into divers absurdities both in Opinion and Practice, of which anon; at present we will consider it in its full Latitude. But here I am afraid, that People, who are ignorant of the matter, will think I Romance; it will be a hard matter to perswade them, that any mortal Man should challenge to himself such a prodigious unlimited Power. For let Fiction it self devise the utmost Power, that it is possible for Man even but in Imagination to be capable of, and that is it which the *Pope* claims, and upon fair Opportunities *exerciseth*; and if he could do it *de jure* and validly, every Soul must be subject unto him. The pretended *Regalia Sti. Petri* are more, and greater than all the Powers on Earth beside put together; many of the Particulars whereof being collected by Dr. *Barrow*, I will make bold to transcribe them from him, and they are these small Matters.

- ' To be superiour to the whole Church, and
- ' to its Representative a general Synod of
- ' Bishops. To convocate general Synods at
- ' his pleasure; all Bishops being obliged to at-
- ' tend upon Summons from him. To preside
- ' in Synods, so as to suggest Matter, promote,
- ' obstruct, over-rule the Debates in them.
- ' To confirm, or invalidate their Determinati-
- ' ons, giving Life to them by his Assent, or sub-
- ' stracting it by his Dissent. To define Points
- ' of Doctrine, or to decide Controversies au-
- ' thoritatively; so that none may presume to
- ' contest, or dissent from his Dictates. To e-
- ' nact

' nact, establish, abrogate, suspend, dispense
 ' with Ecclesiastical Laws and Canons. To re-
 ' lax, or evacuate Ecclesiastical Censures by
 ' Indulgence, Pardon, &c. To void Promi-
 ' ses, Vows, Oaths, Obligations to Laws by
 ' his Dispensation. To be the Fountain of all
 ' Pastoral Jurisdiction and Dignity. To Con-
 ' stitute, Confirm, Judge, Censure, Suspend,
 ' Depose, Remove, Restore, Reconcile Bi-
 ' shops. To Confer Ecclesiastical Dignities,
 ' and Benefices by paramount Authority, in
 ' way of Provision, Reservation, &c. To ex-
 ' empt Colleges, Monasteries, &c. from Ju-
 ' risdiction of their Bishops, and ordinary Su-
 ' periors. To Judge all Persons in all Spiri-
 ' tual Causes, by calling them to his Cogni-
 ' zance, or delegating Judges for them; with
 ' a final and peremptory Sentence. To receive
 ' Appeals from all Ecclesiastical Judicatories;
 ' and to reverse their Judgments, if he findeth
 ' cause. To be himself unaccountable for a-
 ' ny of his Doings, exempt from Judgment,
 ' and liable to no Reproof. To erect, trans-
 ' fer, abolish Episcopal Sees. To exact
 ' Oaths of Fealty and Obedience from the
 ' Clergy. To found Religious Orders; or to
 ' raise a Spiritual *Militia* for Propagation and
 ' Defence of the Church. To Summon and
 ' commissionate Soldiers by Croisade, &c. to
 ' fight against Infidels, or persecute Infidels.
 One would think these might Suffice him,
 and yet that learned Person hath here omitted
 (besides others) one very material Branch of
 Power, which well becomes his *Holiness*, and
 mightily recommends his *Communion*, and
 that is to *Interdict whole Churches and Kingdoms,*
 that

that there shall be no solemn publick Worship of God without his Allowance; a rare Vicar of Christ, without whose leave his God and Master must not be publickly acknowledged, and yet all this is not enough; the whole Spiritual Power will not satisfy him, unless he may have the *Temporal* also. It is true, that they say he hath not this Power directly, but then again they own him to have it indirectly, and in *ordine ad Spiritualia*. Now it is not a Farthing matter which way he comes by it, so he have it, may exercise it, and all must submit to it. For it is an easy matter to make any thing relate to, or affect Spirituals, and then all is his own, and by vertue of this Power he can Depose Kings and Princes, and Dispose of their Kingdoms and Territories to others; and in Despite of the Constitutions, and Laws of the Places, and Oaths, and Obligations of the Persons can discharge Subjects from their Allegiance, to the one, and transfer it to another; upon which Account all Kings in effect can be no better than his Vassals, now that he not only challengeth this Power, but upon occasion hath exercised it in most, if not all the Particulars mention'd, may be prov'd from downright matter of Fact, and authentick Instruments, if it shall be required. Now whatever others, who are out of reach, may say in opposition to this, shall be considered presently; in the mean time I think this ought to be taken for the Doctrine of the Church of Rome: For where shall I look for the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, but at Rome, and with the Pope? Who can better tell it me? And what Voucher of greater Authority than the Pope will they set up

up, upon whom I may depend for a certain knowledge of what is *Roman Doctrine*? And Doth not he so assert this, that he will by no means depart from it? And while he doth so; all that others say is idle talk. If he would quit this Claim, there might be some room for Treaty and Debate; but while he obstinately adheres either to this or *Infallibility*, there can be no complying with him, without resolving to be Slaves in this Life, and to run the hazard of Salvation in another.

Our *Essay-maker* himself seems to be unwilling to Communicate, if held to such hard Conditions. For having mentioned *Bellarmin's* Opinion to this effect he adds: *Under these Terms there's no Communicating with him*, which imports, a disallowing of Communion upon these Terms. For if not with him, why with any other upon the same Terms? But yet this is only an impertinent and trifling Saying, as being contradictory to the Rules and Practice of that Communion. For if *Bellarmino* were now living, he must Communicate with him, there being no Separation in that Church of those, who lower the Pope's Power from those, who extol it to the height; and if he were of that Communion, he must Communicate with all them now living, who are of *Bellarmino's* Opinion, and stretch the Pope's Power to the utmost, though he himself had never so mean an Opinion of it; but, nevertheless, he shall be heard, what he can say for himself.

This may, and doth seem to some so vast and weighty a Block, as can neither be removed, nor got over; and yet our Author

D

makes

makes nothing of it, but blow it away as if it were no more than a Straw, or a Feather; you need not scruple Communion for all this, and he will give you reasons for it too; and first in general he tells you, that many in that *Communion* condemn the Notion of such an *unlimited Power*, and he gives the Names of several, which it is needless to recite; because I grant it to be true. But then I have several Things to object both against their *Opinion* and *Practice*; and first I say, the gainfaying or opposition doth not become a *Doctrine* of the Church of *Rome*, but proves them to be so far *Dissenters* from a *Doctrine* of that Church; for whether of the twain shall we believe, the *Pope*, and those concurring with him, or those opposing him, and disapproved by him? If those, who deny such a Power, can make it a *Doctrine* of their Church, whether the *Pope*, and his *Adherents*, will or not, then either they themselves have a greater Power than the *Pope*, or else there may be two opposite and inconsistent *Doctrines*, both *Doctrines* of the same Church at the same time, one of these two they must allow, let them take which pleaseth them best, and then it will be time enough to discourse the matter further; since therefore, these Men have no Power to make a *Doctrine* of their Church, and the *Supremacy* is certainly a *Doctrine* of their Church, it must follow, that not their Opposition, but what they oppose is to be taken for the *Doctrine* of that Church, and if it be so, then all that our Author hath said is meer Sham, and only an *Artifice* to trick Men out of their *Religion* and *Conscience*.

In

In the next place let us consider of what account the *Opposers* of this *Doctrine* are in the *Church of Rome*. I grant that they may be Men of Parts and Learning, yea, even of more sincere Piety than the rest, and well-wishers to the Peace of Christendom; but then is it not a sad Case, that the *Church of Rome* should have the worse Opinion of them for this? There is every where a mark set upon them, and all possible care taken to prevent their being admitted into any considerable Ecclesiastical Employments, which they rarely get into, and that with great Difficulty; they are look'd upon as *turbulent Persons*, *disturbers* of the *Church*, as not thorough nor *sound Catholics*; and the *Pope* wants not a Will to be reveng'd of them, and make them renounce their Sentiment, did not Fear, and the Power of *Princes* restrain him; and this he hath often discovered, when he hath had fit Opportunity. Indeed, Interest sometimes may prevail with him, not only to wink at, but perhaps even to encourage this seeming Opposition, as when the Business is to gain *Profelytes*, and bring such over to their *Communion*, as do not well digest this *harsh Doctrine*: Then they shew only the wide end of the Horn, where they may easily slip in; but being once in, they may thrust forward, till they peep out of the little end of the Horn, but then there they stick fast, and are made Prisoners in little ease for ever; for greater Things than these they will not only permit but encourage, if their designs be thereby advanced, otherwise, *Pius Quintus*, had not so well rewarded. *Faithful Cummin*, for railing against himself, and

the Mass, that thereby he might take occasion to condemn all *set Forms, Ceremonies, Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, and under pretence of greater Purity, sow *Discord*, and raise *Divisions* amongst *Protestants*; and the very same Pretensions, which were at first set up by that *Dominican Fryar*, are made use of by all the *Sectaries* to this Day. This I think ought to be a considerable Caution to all good Christians, how they give heed to these *Smoothers* and *Mollifiers* of the *Roman Doctrine*; for they only compound and lay on the Bait, the Hook lyes hid and covered, so that those, who bite, are in no small danger of being caught.

Although I think what hath been said to be a sufficient answer in this matter; yet this being the main Remora, and great Controversie between us, I shall take the Liberty to clear it a little further from our Author's Mitigations; and perhaps he himself would never have raised the low Opinion of those Men into a Plea to enter into that Communion, if he had considered their inconsistency with themselves in this matter, as they are in that Communion, which will clearly appear from their *Opinion* it self, and from their *Obligations*; as to the first, all these very Men, who are for *limiting* the *Pope's Power*, if they knew how, at the same time *acknowledge* his *Supremacy*. For can they agree to tell us, what that *Supremacy* is? If not, where shall we stop? If we cannot follow all, who must we follow? But then the Question will be, How he came by an Authority more than all the rest? If you answer the *Pope*, then our Author's Plea is out of doors. Will they allow him the same

Autho-

Authority as in the *Primitive Times*? He will not be content with that, and besides they themselves allow him *more*. Will they limit him to the *Canons*? As those now are in their Church, they dare not stand by that; and even our Author himself opposeth it, and flings them all off. For tho' he endeavours to persuade us, *That the Decretals in the Canon Law are not propos'd nor esteem'd, as of Faith*, yet he warily forbears to tell us, whether they be, or not, respectively *Terms of Communion*: However he plainly accuseth them of *Error*, and rejects them wholly as of no force in this case, (p. 27, 28.) and seeing neither he nor they will allow their famous *Council of Lateran* to determine the matter, I see not what *Rule or Law* they have, whereby certainly to know, what is that *Supremacy* which they *acknowledge*, and how far it *extends*. Those, who acknowledge the *Canons* and the *Council*, tho' they have nothing to scruple, yet they know what they have to do; but these Men are entangled in their own Doctrine; they are got into such a *Wood*, that they can find no way out; they know not certainly when to obey, and when not, much less how to justify their Disobedience. And if they could agree to prescribe certain Limits to their High Priest, yet of what Authority would it be? Would not this in particular Persons be accounted an unpardonable Presumption? And if upon the Principles of the Roman Church, this could be no Warrant for them, much less could it warrantize others; so that this can be no Argument to us to embrace their *Communion*, which would rather lead us into a *Labyrinth*, than direct us into the *right way*. But

But this is not the worst of these Mens case ; for in that Communion they must unavoidably enter into deep and sacred *Obligations*, which are inconsistent with their *Opinions* and *Judgment* of the *Pope's Power* ; so that they must either recede from their *Judgment*, or violate their *Obligations*, unless they can satisfy themselves often to act contrary to the *dictates* of their own *Conscience* ; which thing, as it will be no commendation of their *honesty* and *sincerity*, so can it be no great recommendation of their *Communion*. The *Oath*, which every *Bishop* and *Metropolitan* takes to the *Pope*, shews in great measure not only what *Power* he claims, but what *Obedience* they promise, and how inconsistent it is with that *Opinion* of the *Pope's Power*, wherewith our Author would sham us. Every particular in the *Oath* runs very high, but the whole being too long to recite, I shall only set down so much, as makes more evidently for the present purpose. Amongst other things then, every such Person solemnly Swears thus, ' Jura, honores, privilegia, & auctoritatem Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ, Domini nostri Papæ & Successorum prædictorum conservare, defendere, augere, promovere curabo. Neque ero in consilio, vel facto, seu tractatu, in quibus contra ipsum Dominum nostrum, vel eandem Romanam Ecclesiam aliqua sinistra vel prejudicialia Personarum, juris, honoris, status & Potestatis eorum machinentur, & si talia a quibuscunq; tractari vel procurari novero, impediam hoc pro posse. ——— Regulas sanctorum Patrum, (quibus nunc intelligunt Regalia sancti Petri) decreta, ordinationes, seu dispositiones, reservava-

'servationes, provisiones, & mandata Aposto-
 'lica totis viribus observabo, & faciam ab aliis
 'observari. i. e. *I will take care to preserve,*
defend, augment, advance the Rights, Honours, Pri-
ileges, and Authority of the holy Roman Church,
of our Lord the Pope, and his Successors aforesaid.
I will not be in any Council, Action or Treaty,
wherein shall be plotted against him our Lord, or
the said Roman Church, any thing to the hurt or
Prejudice of their Persons, Right, Honour, State
and Power, and if I shall know any such thing
to be treated of, or endeavour'd by any whatsoever,
I will hinder it to my power. ——— The Rules
of the Holy Fathers (by which they mean the
Royalties of St. Peter) the Degrees, Ordinances,
or Disposals, Reservations, Provisions, and Man-
dates Apostolick, I Will observe with all my
might, and cause them to be observed by others.
Here is enough in all Conscience, not only
required by him, but promised upon Oath by
them, and let any one tell me how this is con-
sistent with that Diminutive, Ridiculous, or
rather no Supremacy, which our Author would
shuffle us off with. Will he perswade us, that
to set him at Defiance is, to preserve, augment,
and promote his Honour and Authority? Do those
perform their Word and Promise not to bear,
or suffer any thing in prejudice of his State and
Dignity, who would lessen his Power with all
their Hearts, and flatly deny what is here claim'd
and sworn to? But you will say that this con-
cerns only the Bishops. If it were so; that were
too much; but with your good leave it hath
its influence on all; for they promise not on-
ly for themselves, but also to make others to
observe these things; and under their care all
 are

are comprehended. But for your further satisfaction we will enquire, whether there be not so much required from all sorts of Persons, as not only utterly overthrows our Authors Assertion, but bids fair to establish the utmost Power the Pope claims; And because our Author denies, that there is any thing relating to the *Supremacy* in the *Formula* set forth by *Pius Quartus*, we will look into that, and see to what Persons it extends, and what it requires. But first it ought to be observed, that every *Article* in that *Formula* is to be acknowledged, and Sworn to as *de fide*: For the Title is *Forma juramenti Professionis fidei*, i. e. *The Form of the Oath of the Profession of Faith*; whatsoever therefore is part of the *Oath*, is part of the *Profession of Faith*, in the Body of the *Bull* it is call'd *publica Orthodoxæ fidei Professio*, i. e. *The publick Profession of the Orthodox Faith*; and so every *Article* therein is made as much an *Article of Faith*, as any *Article* in our *Creed*, when all the *Articles* are repeated, they are be thus clos'd up, *Hanc veram Catholicam fidem extra quam nemo Salvus esse potest, &c.* *This true Catholick Faith, without which no Man can be saved, &c.* and I know not what more can be required to make them *Articles of Faith*, than that without the *Belief and Profession* of them no Man can be saved; and with Reference to the whole *Profession*, and equally to every part of it, the Party, to whom the *Oath* is Administred, saith. *Ego idem N spondeo, voveo, ac juro.* *I do promise, Vow, and Swear*, i. e. He doth Swear to the Truth, and his Belief of all those *Articles*, and Vow and Promise to continue in the same, as the
Words

Words in the Body of the *Bull* explains it; and all this is said to be done juxta Concilii Tridentini dispositionem, according to an Order of the Council of Trent. Now of these Articles I will, at present, cite only two: The first is this, ' Sanctam Catholicam, & Apostolicam Romanam Ecclesiam, omnium Ecclesiarum Matrem, & Magistram agnoso, Romanoq; Pontifici, B. Petri Apostolorum Principis Successori, ac Jesu Christi Vicario veram obedientiam spondeo ac juro, i. e. I acknowledge the Holy Catholick and Apostolick Roman Church to be the Mother, and Mistress of all Churches; and to the Bishop of Rome, being the Successor of Blessed Peter the Prince of the Apostles, and the Vicar of Jesus Christ I Promise and Swear true Obedience. The other is this; ' Cætera item omnia a Sacris Canonibus, & æcumenicis Conciliis, ac præcipue a Sacrosancta Tridentina Synodo tradita, definita, & declarata indubitanter recipio, atque profiteor, simulq; contraria omnia, atque hæreses quascunq; ab Ecclesia damnatas, rejectas, & anathematizatas, ego pariter damno, rejicio & anathematizo. All other Matters delivered, defined, and declared by the Holy Canons, and General Councils, and especially by the Sacred Council of Trent, I receive and profess without any manner of doubt; and likewise all Things contrary thereto and all Heresies whatsoever condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the Church (i. e. the Church of Rome,) I, in like manner, condemn, reject, and anathematize. He had need have a vast wide Throat, who can swallow this last without choaking; but I will pass this by, at present, and only take a short view of the first: By

E

the

the *Holy Catholick* and *Apostolick Roman Church* must be meant, the *particular Roman Church*; For to what end else is she stiled the *Mother* and *Mistress* of all Churches? And the Pope is made the *Head* of this Church, and according to them in consequence thereof the *Head* of all other Churches; and it will not satisfy him to be the *Successor* of St. Peter, the Prince of the *Apostles*, unless he be also the *Vicar* of *Jesus Christ*; that is, in their Sense, so his *Vicar*, as to be his only *immediate Vicar* upon Earth, having a power over all others; so that they may take it for an Honour to be his *Vicars* or *Legats*: And to him thus plac'd above all others, they *promise* and *swear true Obedience*. Now if we enquire what this *true Obedience* is, must we learn it from him, to whom the Oath is made, or from him, who makes the Oath? If an Oath must be understood in that Sense, which those, who make it, shall please to put upon it; then not only the *security* of an Oath, but the *certainty* of *Faith* may be lost in this Case. For the Matter of the Oath being an Article of *Faith*, such various Senses and Interpretations may easily arise, as may make the *Faith* it self in that particular *uncertain*. And then who shall be able to profess, and swear it *Indubitanter*, as they require? This would be to frustrate the whole Design, and to make a meer mockery of their whole Contrivance, who do not use to play at Childrens Play. It remains therefore that we understand *true Obedience* in their Sense, to whom it is made, that they may have a certain Security thereby. And here I desire to know, how our Author will bring off his Men, who
either

either deny, or make little or nothing of the *Pope's Supremacy*, that the *Roman Communion* may be easie? For if that exalted State, which the Oath implies be his right; he may certainly make a just claim to a greater share of Obedience, than any other Person in the World. And if they deny that Obedience, which is *intended*, and they by Oath *promise*, they not only *violate* their Oath, but *renounce* that *Faith*, without which (as they acknowledge in their Oath) they cannot be *saved*. Let not our Author therefore tempt us to the *Communion* of the Church of Rome, by relating to us the Opinion of his *moderate Romanists*, till he can acquit them of being according to the Principles of the Roman Church, guilty of the Crimes of *Perjury* and *Infidelity*. I must confess, I do, and ever did take these to be the best sort of Men in that Communion, as being in a Preparation for, and desirous of Terms of Peace; and therefore am heartily sorry for the hard Circumstances they lye under; but then this ought rather to be a warning to us, that we keep out of the Snare, than to run into such a woful perplex'd Condition, when we are free from it.

I know it will be here again objected, that neither is this Oath administred to all. To which I answer, that it affects all, and those, who do not swear are obliged to own the matter of the Oath in the same Sense, as they who swear it. To make this appear, it is first observable, that this Oath is actually administred to many more than the former; for besides, *Bishops*, *Dignataries*, and all that *have cure* of Souls, all that are provided for in any *Monasteries*, *Convents*, or *R.*
E 2
ligious,

ligious Houses, and all Orders of Regulars, even Military are obliged to take it; so that nothing belonging to the Church can escape, and the design of the Oath we are told is this, Ut unius & ejusdem fidei professio uniformiter ab omnibus exhibeatur, unicaq; & certa illius forma cunctis innotescat; i. e. That one, and the same profession of Faith may be uniformly exhibited by all, and one certain form thereof be made known to all. And then those, who do swear for themselves, do likewise in the same Oath swear with respect to others, *That they will endeavour that the same Profession of Faith shall be Preached, Taught, and held by all, any ways belonging to their Care; and this I think must take in all as to the Profession, though not to the Oath, unless there be any among them, whose Souls they think themselves not bound to take care of.* But then to come home to our selves, if we will go into that Communion, we must enter by this Door. For it is expressly said, *Eadem professione uti tenentur, quicunq; hæresi remeantes ad fidem Ecclesiæ Catholicæ revertuntur; i. e. All those whosoever that forsake Heresie, and return to the Faith of the Catholick Church, are bound to use the same Profession of Faith.* Now that we are Hereticks in their Esteem, I think no body makes any doubt; and therefore who ever escapes, we may be sure we shall not, but if we will go into them, it must be upon these Terms; and if upon these Terms; then in that Communion another sort of Power in the Pope must be acknowledged than our Author prates of; and other Articles of Faith admitted, which he would perswade us may be laid aside; and it

it is as much as a Man's Soul's worth but to doubt of any of them, if the *Pope* and *Council of Trent* are to be believed. A Man must have a strong Faith, who will be a Romanist; otherwise they will damn him as much when he comes in to them, as they did before for keeping out from them. I think I have now proved such a *Supremacy* to be the *Doctrine* of the *Church of Rome*, as we neither can nor ought to submit to; and till he will relinquish that, no Terms of Peace can be treated of; and now let the World judge, whether our *Essayer* hath dealt truly and ingeniously in making the *Communion* of the *Church of Rome* so *easy*, as he endeavours to perswade us.

After the general Consideration of the *Supremacy*, he treats of two particular Branches of it, but lets numberless other parts of it lye concealed, as not worth taking notice of. The first is the *deposing Power*, as to which he puts this Question, *Whether the Pope has a Power over Temporals, so as to depose Princes, and to absolve their Subjects from their Allegiance?* And to avoid tediousness, hither may be referr'd, what he discourseth with respect to other Questions, concerning the *Facts of Popes, Gracian's Decrees, the Canon Law, and the Lateran Council*. If the *Pope* have such a *Power*, not only the *Obligations, and Oaths of Subjects*, but the very *Laws and Constitutions of Countries and Kingdoms* would signifie nothing, when ever he pleaseth to interpose it; and thus all the *Civil States in Christendom* would be in a very tottering uncertain Condition. For they would be mutable at his pleasure, he might overturn, pull down, and set

set up, whom, when, where and how he pleased. This were to make all *Princes*, more than his *Feudatories*, even his very *Slaves*, and therefore not to be endured. And if the *Gallican Church* condemn'd Santarellus's *Opinion of the Pope's deposing Power, as False, Erronious, contrary to the Word of God, Pernicious, Seditious and Detestable*, we are far from blaming them, or our Author for being of the same *Opinion*; but that which we complain of is, that the *Pope* heeds none of these things, but keeps up his *Claims*, and makes use of the *Power*, when ever he gets an *Advantage*, and seeing he will not admit sound *Doctrine*, nor do us right, we have good reason to do our selves right, and keep from under his *Clutches* while we are so.

What *Power* our Author would allow the *Pope* is uncertain, but his way of management of this *Argument* gives ground to suspect, that he is a favourer of the height of it; for all his *Arguments* and *Instances* are applied to this only thing, To prove, that *the Deposing Power is not a Doctrine of Faith*; and by this means he would impose upon his unwary Reader, as if it were of small *Consequence*, and no hinderance of *Communion*, let the *Power* be otherwise as great as you can imagine. That it is very near to a *Doctrine of Faith* in the Judgment of many, might be easily proved; but I am not willing to spend time in disputing that Matter, let it not be a *Doctrine of Faith*, for God forbid it should; for, how deplorable were the Condition of all *honest* and *loyal Subjects*, if they were bound to believe, that they should be eternally damn'd,
if

if they did not *oppose*, resist, and rise in *Rebellion* against their *lawful Sovereign* as oft as the *Pope* should require it? But if it be not a *Doctrine of Faith*, is it not a *Doctrine* of the *Roman Church*? And may it not by that means be altogether as *mischievous* and *pernicious*? Doth not the *Practice* of the *Popes* in many more *Instances* of *deposing Princes*, than our *Author* hath mentioned, plainly shew, that he accounts this as a *Branch* of the plenitude of his *Power*, and would have it accounted by all a *Doctrine* of the *Church* he presides over? If any *Man* will please to read his *Bulls*, or *Instruments*, to that effect, (which are too tedious to be recited here) I am much mistaken, if he can go away unsatisfied, that the *Pope* doth not go the utmost length in asserting his *Authority* in this case. Add to this the *Decretals*, the *Canon-Law*, the great *Council* of *Lateran*, all which Vouch and Establish this *Doctrine*; if all these cannot make it *de fide*, (which perhaps some other would dispute) yet do they not manifest it to be a *Doctrine* of the *Roman Church*? For how shall I know, what is the *Doctrine* of a *Church* if not from her *Canons* and *Councils*? But what would you say, if this *Doctrine* of the *Deposing Power* be now actually taught in *England* amongst the *English Catholics*, as they call themselves? What if others learnt it from them? What if they are taught not only that the *Pope*, but even those they call *Hereticks* may *Depose Princes*, yea even of their *own Religion*, if they be not for their turn, and all to this end, that no *Prince* might ever sit quietly on the *English Throne*,

Throne, nor the Land be at rest, till it was brought under the Roman Yoke? The Case in short is this, upon the Expulsion of K. J. many Romanists stuck at the Oath of Fidelity required by K. W. the matter was consulted and considered of at Rome; and it was not only determined, that they might lawfully do it, but arguments used to perswade them to it. There is indeed one remarkable Exception, *Si Rex Gulielm exigentur juramentum fidelitatis non precise administrationem Temporalem respicientis sed ferientis Catholicam fidem etiam prætexta servandi vitam, Familiam & bona, non licere,* i. e. if K. W. require an Oath of Fidelity not precisely, respecting temporal Government, but hurtful to the Catholick Faith, although it be with a pretence of preserving their Lives, Families and Estates, yet then it is not lawful. And is not this true Primitive Doctrine? The Primitive Christians willingly acknowledged, and honestly obeyed the Emperours, when Heathens, when Idolaters, when Bloody Persecutors, and when they did all they could to extirpate the Christian Religion from the Face of the Earth: But our Roman Catholicks must not own any as their Sovereign, if he do any thing in Prejudice of their Roman Religion. But as for the deposing that Unfortunate Prince, the Casuist makes a meer Squiff of it. For saith he, *Quot autem Sunt Principes, qui jure merito privantur regno?* i. e, How many Princes are there, who justly and deservedly are deprived of their Kingdoms? So that not only Heretical Princes, but those of their own Perswasion, if they be not Officious enough, may according to them be lawfully deposed. And this is the more obser-

observable, because this very *Doctrine* of the *Supremacy* was at the bottom of all this. For K. J. though a *Papist*, yet not being *Papist* enough to yield up that Point, the old Fox *Odeschalchi* then *Pope* entered into the *Confederacy* against him, and his *Embassador* was *disrespectfully* treated at *Rome*, while another about the same time found a kinder Reception, whatever was his Errand there. Out of the same Shop came the *Doctrine* of the *Power of the People*; and for what reason it is now so much, and so publicly every Day asserted, inculcated, and spread all over the *Kingdom* in *Print*, I leave them to guess, who are more concerned in it; but perhaps the *Observer* can tell.

From what hath been said, I think there is small reason to doubt, but that the *deposing* Power, which is an appurtenance of the *Supremacy*, is a *Doctrine* of the *Church of Rome*, nor doth our Author plainly deny it, only he will not have it to be a *Doctrine of Faith*; but if it be not matter of *Faith*, in spite of his Teeth, it will be matter of *Practice*; and I could wish it were the worst thing in the *Church of Rome* to assert the necessity of good Works, as well as of *Faith*; there might then be more hopes of our agreement: But this is a *Doctrine*, which will produce Works very unbecoming the *Christian Faith*. Since therefore he will not have it to be a *Doctrine of Faith*, let us enquire, whether it be the better or the worse for that? And whether upon that account our Communion with *Rome* be more feasible? And to me it seems to make the matter rather worse than better, and more to persuade us against *Rome*; for if it were a *Doctrine of Faith*, and received as such, there would be an end of all *Dispute* and *Trouble*; some particular Persons might suffer by *Deposition*, but it would be esteemed justly; there would be no general *Commutations*, but the *Community* be in quiet, and at rest. But if it be a matter of *Indifferency*, where our Author seems to leave it, so that a Man may chuse which side of the Question seems to him most reasonable; then he that allows not the *deposing* Power

Power shall be a good *Catholick*; but he that approves it, with the *Pope* shall be a better. Now this is a Doctrine fit to produce all manner of Mischief, and to make the most bloody Work that ever was known. For put the Case, that we were in the *Roman Communion*, and that the *Pope* should take upon him to depose our lawful Sovereign; those, who acknowledged the *deposing Power*, would think themselves discharged of their *Allegiance*, and that they ought to rise up against him: Those, who *disallowed* that Doctrine, would think themselves bound by their *Allegiance* to stand by him, and assist him with their Lives and Fortunes against his *Rebels*; and thus the whole Kingdom would be divided into two Parties, each Arming themselves, and taking all Opportunities to Murther each other; and till one Party were utterly destroyed there would be no end of it. Because both would think themselves justifiable in Conscience in what they did; and thus, we might have *Guelphs* and *Gibelines* in *England*; and if by an easie mistake with the *Vulgar*, the frightful Names of *Elves* and *Goblins* arose from the dreadful Reports related of those cruel Factions, who for two or three Generations harassed *Italy*, and the adjacent Parts, what Names would be invented for them, if such a Tragedy were acted on our own Stage, which in Course would happen, when the *deposing Power* were put in Practice? He that can think this a strong Motive to prevail with Men to join in the *Roman Communion*, seems to be not ill qualified to make an Advocate for *Cut-throats* and *Murderers*. This claim therefore must be laid aside, before we can with safety hearken to any Proposals.

His next question is, *Whether a Nation that owns the Pope's Authority can be free from Slavery?* (p. 33.) and another which follows (p. 38) is to the same effect, and so to avoid tediousness, may be consider'd together. Now I take it to be a very unlucky Encouragement to enter into any *Communion*, when it can be made a likely Question, whether we shall not, at the same time, enter into Slavery? For let the
Issue

Issue be what it will, the danger is certain; and though we should not Miscarry, yet we must be always on our Guard. I think therefore our Author had done more prudently, and might have better serv'd an ill caule, if he had wholly omitted these Questions. *Slavery* Sounds so very harshly in the Ears of *English-men*, that they are apt to start, and become bouldrous at the very naming it; and seeing we are now in that respect free, I do not understand the Wisdom of trying the Experiment, whether we shall run our selves into thralldom, or not? But seeing our Learned Author makes an *Essay* this way, it may concern us to inquire, whether he will prepare us for it, or defend us against it? And here he thinks to stop all our Mouths with the Names of two as Great Men as any their Age afforded, Arch-bishop *Bramhall* and *Grotius*. And first, the *Arch bishop* is introduc'd, telling us how many things the *Pope* cannot do in *France*, i. e. he cannot lawfully do them; but what if he actually does them? We know he claims the Power of it; either then their Liberty must be lost, or thereupon will follow great Troubles and Confusions; and between their *Pragmatick Sanctions* and *Concordates*, that Nation hath pretty well smarted, and the *Pope* is so very apt to encroach, that they are forc'd to keep a constant watchful Eye against his Tricks and Artifices, of which we are not in like hazard, who own not his Power, and so are in better Case; but it is worth Observation, that Abp. *Bramhall*, with other things, made use of those Instances to justify our Proceedings against the *Pope*, and Vindicate us from *Criminal Schism*; but this Author makes use of the same to persuade us to submit to the *Pope*, certainly one of these two are much out in the Application of their Argument; but some Men can make *quidlibet, ex quolibet*, and tempt us to Slavery with those Arguments, which should Fortify us against it. He next gives a large Account from both those Authors, of what not only the Kings of *France* but *Spain*, and other Princes who own the *Pope's* Power, have done in Opposition to it, and certainly it is well they did

so, for otherwise they had been Enslav'd, but they may take trouble enough who are in Love with it; we have no occasion for such struggling; they may still be caught one time or other, we are not in that danger, and I think it the best and safest way to keep out of it. In Conclusion he tells us, *That all those Nations which own the Pope, are provided with sufficient Power, and Means, to Maintain, Defend and Secure all Rights, Liberties and Privileges, both of Church and State,* (p. 43) and so are we too without owning him, only they are in continual danger of having those *Rights, Liberties, and Privileges* at every turn wrested from them; so are not we; and we are not very desirous of putting our selves in a condition to Fight for that which we already have, least some time or other we lose it; we know what Advantage the Pope made of the Straits and Troubles of King John; and how his Creatures to this day asserts this to be a *Feudatory Kingdom*, no doubt but we should be in a blessed State if all our Kings were his *Vassals*, and he our *Supreme Temporal*, as well as *Spiritual Prince*. These are not things to be plaid with, and therefore all such pretences must be fully and solemnly Renounc'd, before we can talk of any Terms with that crafty Gentleman at Rome; but amongst all his Flourishes, certainly our Author forgot a noble Instance of securing our Freedom, and that is, the setting up the *Inquisition*; it's true, that is not yet Establish'd in all Popish Countries, but the Pope's Good Will and Endeavours will never be wanting, and he might have many pretences to bring it in here, rather than other places: But, in the mean time, if our Author have a mind to live in a place of such *Liberty*, he may easily know where to find it: The Persons in that Office will tell him what is *de Fide*, without half this *Disputing*, and he must presently believe them too, or do worse, you cannot imagine what a strange prevalent Art they have in persuading, they will teach a Man more in an *Hour*, than he shall Learn of others in *Seven Years*, and yet I have no mind to go to School to such *Masters*.

Our *Essay-maker* finding it very difficult to establish all the *Pope's* extravagant pretensions, at last is willing to take up with the *Western Patriarchate*, and it was politickly done; for let the *Cat* get in her *Head*, and she will draw her whole *Body* after it, and here he thinks himself safe, as having a Royal voucher for it in our Church. *We find* (saith he) *that King James 1st own'd the Pope to be Patriarch of the West, and the Church of Rome to be our Mother*; and to prove this he cites his *Speech in Parliament*; as also his *Premonition to all Christian Princes*. But then he should have told us the Limitations the King gave to these concessions. He saith he should thus far give his consent *for himself*, and if that were yet the question, (p. 45.) but the *Pope* will not be content with this, and the *grant* becomes void, where the *condition* of it is not accepted. But suppose *King James* did give up both these; it shews, indeed, his strong and christian Inclinations to promote Agreement, and that he was more desirous of the *Peace of Christendom*, than the *Pope*, who will not be content with more than his due, unless he may have all that is to be had; but this creates neither the *Pope* nor *Rome* any Right to these matters. For *King James* spake only *for himself*; and tho' a wise King, and a good *Chaiistian*, yet never pretended to be *infallible*; and therefore, with all due Honour to his Memory, I shall take leave to dissent from his Opinion in this particular, because I have much to say against both these Concessions, in the sense they are commonly taken by the Romanists.

To know upon what account any Church is said to be a *Mother Church* with respect to others, we should enquire what those Churches were, which anciently had the Title of *Matrices Ecclesiae*; and they were of two sorts, either such as were immediately founded by the *Apostles*, and consequently in time preceded all subsequent Churches; or such as propagated other Churches, whether they themselves were founded by the *Apostles* or not, yet were they *Mother Churches* with respect to those founded by them. In both these respects *Rome* may be said to be a *Mother Church*; but this will not make her The
Mother

Mother Church. For no less will serve their turns, than that she be (as in the Language of the Council of Trent) stiled *Omnium Ecclesiarum Mater & Magistra*, The Mother and Mistresses of all Churches. But this she cannot be; for if she were the Mother of all, all must be descended from her; and there could be no Christian Church in the World, but in tracing its Pedigree must come up to her as its first Original. But this is apparently false; if any will assert this her pretended Prerogative, I desire them to satisfy me, where Christianity was between the time of our Saviour's resurrection, and the Establishment of a Christian Church at Rome? For with respect to the Churches planted by the Apostles Rome was late a Church; several were before her; and if she be the Mother of all Christian Churches, then from the time of our Saviour's Resurrection till the Church was planted at Rome, there was no Christianity in the World and all those Churches preceding the Church of Rome, and all that descended from 'em neither were, nor are to be accounted Christian Churches, for she could not be Mother to them that were before her; and if none can be Christian, but to whom she is Mother, then none of them were Christian. But if this Consequence be not true, their Antecedent must be false. The truth is, the first Christian Church was at Jerusalem, from thence we came all; nay, I think, I may say into that we were ingrafted, and have a right to our Christian Privileges by vertue of our Original Descent from it; there is no other true Sound of the Gospel, but what agrees with that, which first came forth from thence; and if to be Mother give a Title to be Mistress, then Jerusalem must be acknowledged to be the Mother and Mistress of us all; and if Rome her self be not a Daughter of Jerusalem, she can be no true Church. Nor can she so much as pretend to be the eldest Daughter; for Antioch, and others, were certainly before her; what Advantages she afterwards grasp'd was by being Mistress of the Empire, not Mother of the Church.

This will still farther appear, if we consider the other Title, viz. *Patriarch of the West*. This is a Title the Popes are never pleas'd with, and could wish it might

might never be used ; it is rather cast upon them by others, than accepted by themselves ; for they look upon it as a *limitation* and *diminution*, not any *advancement* of their *Power* and *Authority*. He that cannot be content without *all*, will never be content to be *stinted*. But here our Author is so kind as to do all he can for him ; for he presumes him, at least, to be *Patriarch of the West*, which (setting aside his *Usurpations*) is more than his *Right* ; for it is one thing to be a *Patriarch* in the West, and another to be *Patriarch of the West* ; all the *Western Churches* were not included within the Bounds of his *Patriarchate*, but many of them enjoy the *Cyprian Privileges*. Some think his *Patriarchal Jurisdiction* extended only to the *Suburbitary Churches*, and was of equal extent with the *Civil Power* of the *Roman Prætor ad centesimam lapidem* ; but not to make that matter of dispute, whoever shall read the *Stories* of the *Archbishops of Ravenna and Milan*, must be satisfied, that it was a long time before the *Pope* could be *Master* of so much as *Italy* it self, much less of the *whole West*. But our Author being willing to entice us to *Rome* upon any *Terms*, seeing the present Case is our own, let us see whether we cannot keep clear of him, and I think his pretensions to us on this Score will be found very *Lame*, and that no parts of the *West* had less Relation to him.

For the better discovery of the *Truth* in this Case, it may not be amiss to enquire, as near as we can into the different times the *Christian Religion* was first *Planted* in this *Island*, and at *Rome*, from whence it will appear, that either the *Christian Religion* was entertain'd here before it was at *Rome*, or was brought in from the *Greek or Eastern Churches*, not the *Roman*, and consequently, that we are either *Elder Sister* to the Church of *Rome*, or that she is none of our *Mother*. To this purpose it is observable, that in the beginning of *Christianity* great regard was had to the *Jews*, and great *Tenderness* shewed towards them, as being the *People* into whose Church we were *Engraffed*, and to whose *Privileges* we were *Entituled* ; and their

their *Law*, tho' design'd to be but *Temporary*, yet coming *Originally* from God himself, was to be *respectfully* and *decently* laid aside. On this Account, that they might disoblige the *Jews* as little as might be, and by degrees bring them over, the *first Christian Converts* used many of the *Jewish Observances*, as Matters in themselves indifferent; and it is evident, that among the rest, they observ'd *Easter* exactly with the *Jews*, and having accustom'd themselves to it, continued so to do for some Generations after; but when the *Jews*, and many of the *Jewish Converts*, obstinately insisted upon the necessity of the *Law of Moses*, which in the Consequences of it, overthrew the whole *Christian Religion*, then the *Gentile Christians* were forc'd to separate from them, and to abstain from those *Observances*; and hence it was, that those that were after this Converted to Christianity kept not *Easter* with the *Jews*, but (as more suitable to the *Christian Religion*, and the *Doctrine of the Resurrection*) on the *Lord's-Day* following, the fourteenth of the Moon, now from the Congress of *Polycarp*, and *Amietus*, and the Contest between *Victor* and *Polycrates*, it is plain that the *Roman Church*, from its very beginning, kept *Easter* in this last manner, and yet both pleaded *Apostolical Tradition*, and I believe truly, the *Conversion* of the *Romans* must therefore be of a later date than those, who keep *Easter* with the *Jews*, and the very *Epistle to the Romans* seems not a little to Countenance this; for that it was written after this *Breach* with the *Jews* may be hence reasonably concluded, because *St. Paul* therein lays out all his strength and argument against the Obligations of the *Law of Moses*, and proves not only the non-necessity of it, but the necessity of abstaining from those *Observances* as matters were then controverted; and for want of observing this, many have made woful Mistakes in their Interpretations of that *Epistle*. Now since it is out of all doubt from *Beda's History*, that the *British Church* (then possessed of this Isle) kept their *Easter* not with the *Romans*, but with those Churches of earlier Conversion, it must follow, that either she

was

was before them, or at least that she owes not her Conversion to them; and that she was before them is the more probable, because it is concluded by all even the *Romanists* themselves, that she was of *Apostolical Conversion*.

In this posture the Affairs of the *Britons* continued undisturbed for about 600 Years, when the *Saxons*, had driven them out of their lawful Possessions, and cooped them up for the most part into that Corner of the Isle called *Wales*, where they still kept up their old *Ecclesiastical Authority*, and observed the same *Rites*. But when *Augustine* the Monk, came over for the Conversion of the *Saxons*, he and his Followers crav'd the Assistance of the *Britains*; in order to which they had their Consults and Meetings, but parted upon these two Heads. 1st. That the *Britains* would not yield to keep *Easter* with the *Romans*, but made the very same Plea for their Practice, as *Polycarp*, and *Polycrates* had done long before them. 2dly, That they absolutely denyed the Bishop of *Rome's Supremacy*, or that he was more related to them, than any other *Christian Bishop*; nor would they acknowledge any other *Superiour* over them, under God and his Christ, but the Bishop of *Caerleon*, who according to the most ancient Christian Style, was called *Primæ Sedis Episcopus*. And thus it continued, nor do I find, that they made any Submission, till by the joynt Power of the *Pope* and *Henry* the 1st. they were compelled to it, and that not without much struggling, considering their wasted and weak Condition. So that hence ariseth a Prescription, and that too founded upon Right, for above 1000 Years.

If it be objected, that the *Pope's Primacy* or *Supremacy* was owned by the *Saxon Christians*; and that in succeeding Time his Authority obtained by *Prescription* over the whole Isle. I have these things to return in Answer. 1st. That what was then claimed, was nothing like what the *Pope* now challengeth, and that the *Supremacy* now claimed was then adjudged to be *Antichristian* by the *Pope* himself, as is evident from the Controversy between *John* of *Constantinople* and

Gregory the Great, who was the Pope that sent *Augustine* hither. 2dly, Originally when any where instrumental in converting the People of any Country to the Christian Faith, though they had been ungrateful, if they had not ever acknowledg'd from whom they had receiv'd so inestimable a Benefit, yet the *Pastors* of those Countries from which such *Converters* came, claim'd no *Jurisdiction* over them, but having settled them under sufficient *Ecclesiastical Authority*, left them to exercise that power and *jurisdiction* among themselves under the Rules of *Catholick Communion*: It would be accounted ridiculous, if the *Archbishop* of *Canterbury* should claim a *Jurisdiction* in *Germany*, because *Boniface*, alias *Wilfrid* an *Englismen* converted a great part of that Country, erected *Bishopricks*, and was himself the first *Archbishop* of *Metz*. We can be thankful for any Benefit received, but not so as for that reason to give up our *Christian Rights* and *Liberties*; such a Demand disgraces and spoils the first Kindness, and warns us to look to our selves. 3dly, What Superiour Power the Pope had here, whether as *Patriarch*, or otherwise, he had by *Usurpation*, and what was unlawfully *Usurped* from us by him, may lawfully be resumed by us. Our Author acknowledgeth all Nations to be provided with sufficient power and means to maintain, defend, and secure all Rights, Liberties, and Privileges both of Church and State, and when is the time to exercise that Power, and make use of those means, unless when those Rights, Liberties and Privileges are invaded? Lastly let the most that can be made of a *Prescription*, we can fight him with his own Weapon. For if he claim'd by *Prescription* before, we claim by *Prescription* now, and are in present possession of it. For in defence of our Rights we have been long enough out of his power to make a good and sufficient *Ecclesiastical Prescription* against him. Seeing therefore the Pope, whether as *Patriarch* or otherwise, hath no Superior Power over us, but what we shall please to give him; I cannot think it a fit time to give him the least thing, when it shall be taken as a Pledge, or earnest of *All*, and is only like giving

giving possession of the whole by a *Turf* or a *Twig*. When therefore our *Essay-maker* tells us a long Story of what This, That, and the other Man would grant, I do not think my self concerned in it, or bound to examine for what Reasons, or on what Account they would do it; for though I would do all that I lawfully could to procure the Peace of Christendom, yet till this Question of Power and Authority be clearly stated, and agreed on, and well, and sufficiently secured from future Encroachment; (which the Pope will never willingly consent to) I do not see how there can be any room for a Treaty; and till there is, I think it may be the wisest way to hold fast our own.

We have thus far followed our Author in his disputation concerning the *Pope's Power and Authority*, which is indeed the great and main Obstacle of Peace and Catholick Communion. He next proceeds to particular Doctrines disputed on both sides; but to what purpose? For how is it possible to determine them, till the matter of Authority be first settled? For if you grant *Infallibility* or *Supremacy*, you must give up all those particular Doctrins. For who shall dispute with *Infallibility* or *Supremacy*? But if you deny both, yet unless you can prevail with them to do so too, all your dispute and discourse can signify nothing towards Peace. For let your Arguments be what they will, either of those Points admitted will over-rule all at Pleasure. I might therefore wave all the following Discourse, as fruitless till these matters be first settled and agreed on between us, which is not likely to be in haste! But because our Author thinks it so easie a matter to reconcile us in those Points; I will examine some few of them, to shew, if not him, yet others his mistake. But first I shall crave leave to premise two Observations concerning the Author himself.

He that will set up himself to be an *Empire* between Parties, ought to carry his hand very even, and so thoroughly examine the matters in Difference, as to do equal Justice on both sides. But here is one,

who undertakes our *Cause* without our *consent*; and like a most *liberal Gentleman* either gives away *all* from us, or leaves us no *Security* for what he acknowledgeth to be *due* to us; so that the *Papists* may sue out a *Statute of Bankrupt* against the *Protestant Religion*, for at this Rate all's as good as lost, and in his way of Management, we are or must be utterly *broke*. Only he endeavours to make us a sorry sort of *amends*, by leaving us in a Condition to make *Reprisals*, and instead of our *own*, to take as much or more of *theirs*, though nothing so good; but this is not to *manage*, but *betray* our Cause. For herein he hath out-done even *Papists* themselves, and gives them more than they ask. For the moderate and sober sort of them, though they are apt to blame us, yet freely confess that many Things ought to be corrected and amended in their own Church, and are not only willing, but desirous, and judge it necessary, that several matters should be wholly yielded up to us, which this Author seems to think not worth his Care or Concern. Out of many instances, which might be brought, I shall produce only one, *George Cassander*, who lived and died in the *Roman Communion*, is acknowledged by all Parties to be a Man of great Learning and Judgment; and to no less Persons than the Emperors *Ferdinand* and *Maximilian* the Second, both *Papists*, he writes thus, 'Non negarim tamen multos initio pio Studio, 'ad acriorem reprehensionem quorundam manifestorum abusuum impulsos fuisse, & præcipuam 'causam hujus calamitatis, & distractionis Ecclesiæ 'illis assignandam, qui inani quodam fastu Ecclesiæ 'asticæ potestatis inflati, rectè & modeste admonentes, superbe & fastidiosè contempserunt, & repulerunt. Quare nullam Ecclesiæ firmam pacem Sperandam puto, nisi ab iis initium fiat, qui distractionis causam dederunt, hoc est, ut ii qui Ecclesiasticæ gubernationi præsumunt, de nimo illo rigore aliquid remittant, & Ecclesiæ paci aliquid concedant, ac multorum piorum votis ac monitis obsequentes, manifestos abusus ad regulam divinarum

'narum literaum, & veteris Ecclesiæ, à quâ deflexe-
 runt, corrigant. (Consult. p. 56, 57) i. e. Yet I
 may not deny, but that in the beginning many by a pious
 Inclination and Desire, were enforced to a very sharp re-
 proof of certain manifest Abuses, and that the chief
 Cause of this Calamity and Distraction of the Church is
 to be imputed to those, who being puff'd up with a vain
 haughty Conceit of their Ecclesiastical Power, proudly and
 disdainfully contemned and rejected those, who unbiass'd
 and modestly gave them good Advice. For which cause
 I think, that there can be no hope of any firm Peace for
 the Church, unless the beginning be at them, who have
 been the cause of the Distraction. That is, that those,
 who preside in the Ecclesiastical Government; do abate
 somewhat of that their over-much Rigour, and yield
 something to the peace of the Church, and complying
 with the earnest desires and advice of many godly Men,
 do actually correct manifest Abuses according to the
 Rule of Holy Scripture, and of the antient Church from
 which they have served. See here the difference be-
 twixt a sincere Papist, and a pretended Protestant; the
 one is so much for Truth and Right, that his Inclina-
 tions to us might be suspected, and he thought to
 be our Friend; the other is so Frank and Free, that
 he gives up all, as if he had nothing worth keep-
 ing, and like a Serpent in our Bosome, endeavours
 to Sting us to Death, there is not half the dan-
 ger from an open Enemy, as from a false Friend.

Another thing I shall observe of this Author is, a
 fly trick he often makes use of to shift off, and put a
 slur upon Protestants Arguments, by calling them Con-
 sequences, and then tells us, that being the Papists dis-
 own such Consequences, they are not to be charged
 with what they do not hold, and let this be applied
 to direct Reasoning, (as I think he sometimes doth)
 and all Reasoning and Arguments will be rendred in-
 effectual; therefore, for an Antidote against this Poy-
 son, it seems necessary briefly to enquire when Conse-
 quences are to be regarded, and when not? When
 by Revelation or Demonstration the truth of a thing
 is so Evident, that no Understanding Good Man will
 deny

deny it, there *Consequences* are to be little set by, thus (to instance in our own way, which is Matter of Religion) the *Doctrines of the Blessed Trinity*, of the *Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ*, and of his *Resurrection*, are such, whose *Truth* I am assur'd of from the *God of Truth*, in believing of whom I cannot be deceiv'd, and therefore let Corrupt and Perverse Men raise *Consequences* against these, tho' never so plausible, they ought not to stagger my *Faith*, I may safely despise them, nay, I ought to do it; but then the *Truth* is, that in this Case those things call'd *Consequences* are not really and truly such, but only seem to be so, by reason of the *shortness* of our *Understanding*, which is unable to Fathom such Depths, which should teach us to believe the *Truth*, and enjoy the *benefit*, but not over-curiously to pry into those *Mysteries* which are above the *Reach* of our *Capacities*, and wherein we may certainly lose our selves without possibility of finding *Satisfaction*; in this Case, if in any, *Ignorance is the Mother of Devotion*; but then, when the *Doctrines* themselves, are *inevident*, not warranted by any sufficient *Proof*, if the plain *Consequences* of them be *Bad*, the *Doctrines* themselves cannot be *Good*, and sound and true *Consequences* will be good *Arguments* against them, and I may judge of the *Tree* by the *Fruit*; thus, in the present Case, with what *Arguments* will our Author clearly and satisfactorily evince the *lawfulness* of *Worship of Images*, *Prayers to Saints*, the *Communion* contrary to Christ's own Institution in one kind, and the like? And if he cannot, the *Real Consequences* will not only confute, but be *Chargeable* upon those who maintain such *Opinions*: Thus, if *Divine Honours* and *Religious Worship* are the peculiar of *God Almighty*, and belong only to him, then it is a plain *Consequence* that those, who *Worship Images*, *Rob God* of his *Right* and *Due*, and for so doing shall be answerable to a jealous *God*, who hath said, *That his Glory he will not give to another*. Now, seeing most, if not all the *Romish Doctrines*, of which he Discourseth, are of this Nature, that they are destitute of any *Good Proof*:

Proof; in vain doth he cry out against *Consequences*, for they must and will effect such *Doctrines*; and to fling off *Consequences* in this Case, were not only to debar us from the Means of discovering the Wick- edness of such *Doctrines*, but in a great Measure to deprive us of the Power of reasoning upon them. This therefore is a piece of Craft, to gull us both of our Religion and Reason at once, and I could not but think it requisite to give Notice of so ill a design; and now I come to his particular *Doctrines*.

He begins with the *Invocation of Saints and Angels*, as to which he raiseth several Questions, and severally answereth them; all which are modell'd with all possible advantage to the Roman Cause, but they fall in with one another, and therefore need not be handled distinctly, but I think to give such an Answer as shall reach them all. Tho' we accuse the Church of Rome of dishonouring and undervaluing the Merits and Intercession of our blessed Saviour, yet we never charged them with downright forsaking him, and teaching those of their Communion not to trust in him, which his first Question implies, and therefore he might have spared his pains in proving, *That they place their trust in God, and in the Mediatorship of Christ, hoping for no Salvation, but through the merits of his sacred Passion.* When they treat in particular of the Passion and Merits of Christ, they commonly teach very sound Doctrine; but then did you never hear of the Cow, that gave a good Meal of Milk, and as soon as she had done kick'd it down with her foot? They begin well, and lay a good Foundation; and we may say to them, as St. Paul to the Galatians, *Ye did run well, who did hinder you, that you should not obey the Truth?* (Gal. 5. 7.) No sooner have they laid the foundation, but they build such Stuff upon it, or heap up such materials beside it, that if it do not erase and destroy, yet it doth miserably obscure, deface and endanger it: It is this *rubbish and filth*, from which we desire the Church should be cleansed, and we have cast it out; but if we would communicate with them, we cannot do it, without taking it in again; for it is intermingled with

with their whole Worship, and become an establish'd part of it, and so there is no taking the one without the other; and whether they are not faulty in this particular, is now to be considered.

Whether the *blessed Saints* and *Angels*, who abound with Charity, do not bear us good Will; whether they may not sometimes pray for us; yea, whether they are not sometimes charged with the care of us, are Questions about which I will quarrel with no Man. But this is not a sufficient Ground, that we who want no Encouragement to go directly to God himself, should pray to them; and to make *formal Prayers* to them a part of our *Religious Worship* even in our *Churches*, and the *publick Service*, I think to be not only *unnecessary* and *unwarrantable*, and so to come within the verge of *Superstition*; but also to entrench upon *God's honour*, and to be an *Inlet* into *divers Errors and dangerous practices*, which if not *commended*, are yet *allowed and encouraged*, in the Church of *Rome*: and if any Man in their Communion should speak, or write against them, he would be ill look'd on, if not ill used. *Cassander* hath pleaded their Cause in this Matter as far, if not farther, than it will bear; and yet he complains of practical Errors hence arising, which he thought ought to be reform'd, and yet they are *Consequences*, which our Author takes for very *harmless Things*. The first Error he mentions hath a very bad influence upon Life: For, saith he, '*Impii homines & in peccatis perseverantes ac nullam vitæ emendationem mediantes Sanctorum intercessioni, ac meritis temere confidunt, nec ipsi pænitentia ducti preces suas ad deum adjungant.* (consult. p. 153.) i. e. *Wicked Men, and such as persevere in their Sins, and think not of any amendment of Life, easily trust to the Intercession, and Merits of the Saints, and not moved to Repentance, neglect their Prayers to God.* And is not this an unpardonable Affront, and unsufferable Dishonour to the Almighty? And is not this encouraged in the Church of *Rome*? Are they not advised to make choice of *particular Saints*, as their *Patrons* or *Patrones-*
ses,

ses, to whose particular care they commit themselves, and from whom they expect Relief and Succour? Do not they hope for something extraordinary, who go in long *Pilgrimages* to make their *Orisons* to such and such certain *Saints*? Are not a Set of *Ave Mary's* and *Pater Nosters* rewarded with so many Years *Indulgences* for being said in such and such certain *Churches*? do they not assign or consecrate particular *Saints* as *Patrons* or *Protectors* of whole *Countries*, under whose *protection* the People are to put themselves, and to whom they are to do particular *honour*, and make special *addresses*? How long since is it, that the ridiculous Story was brought over hither, how the *Portugues* had made their *Tutelar Saint* the *Generalissimo* of their *Forces*, and carried his *Image* in great pomp, and with numerous *Attendants*, in the head of their *Army*? And yet I have not heard that he did them any great service. No doubt but that the *Saints* and *Angels* are *ministering Spirits* before the Lord; but I thought it had been his business, and not ours, to assign them their *Employments*. How came the *Pope*, or any other, by the Authority, to dispose of the *Inhabitants* of *Heaven* into several *Offices*, for the use of Men on Earth? Is God himself bound to obey his Orders? What good can we hope from, or what trust can we put in such unwarrantable and presumptuous *Appointments*.

If we consider the Doctrine of the *Council of Trent* in this case, it is set down very ambiguously, and indeed they often purposely so involve Things, that it would puzzle a *Sphinx* to be their *Interpreter*. Their Decree runs thus: '*Sanctos una cum Christo regnantes, orationes suas pro hominibus Deo offerre, bonum & utile esse suppliciter eos invocare, & ob beneficia impetranda a Deo per Filium ejus Jesum Christum dominum nostrum, qui solus noster Redemptor & Salvatore est, ad eorum orationes, opem, auxiliumq; confugere, i. e.* *That the Saints reigning together with Christ, do offer up their Prayers to God for Men: That it is good and profitable, on our bended Knees, to invoke them, and to fly for refuge to their Prayers, help,*

and assistance for obtaining Benefits from God, thro' his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, and only Saviour and Redeemer. And then they proceed to condemn all those, who say, either that they do not pray for us, or that the invoking them to pray for each single Person is Idolatrous, or disagreeable to the Word of God, and dishonourable to the one Mediator of God and Men Christ Jesus; or that it is a silly thing to make either vocal or mental Prayers to the Saints in Heaven. (Con. Trid. Sess. 25.) Here might be many things observed, but I shall only touch lightly. If their suppliciter invoke be taken in a religious sense, and as an act of worship, as it must be here, I know not what more they do in this case to God Almighty; and is not this to rob him of his honour? If they acknowledge Jesus Christ to be our only Saviour and Redeemer, yet if we must fly to the Saints for help and assistance to obtain the Benefit, is not this in effect to tell the People, that it is not to be had without them; and doth not this make them Sharers in the Honour, and us in a great Measure Debtors to them for what we receive? And if there be such Efficacy in mental Prayers to Saints, doth not this suppose them to know our Hearts, which God alone doth? Let us now see how the *Catechism ad Parochos*, which is of equal Authority, improves this Doctrine. And it is observable, that that the very Title of the Chapter or Division is, *de cultu & invocatione Sanctorum*; not only of the Invocation but the worship of Saints. And then treating of the real or supposed good Offices they do us, it follows, *Ob eam causam etiam magis colendi & invocandi sunt*; worship it self was too much, they might have let alone this more worship, for religious worship belongs only to God; nor can they help themselves with their Distinctions of *Latria* and *Dulia*, and *Hyperdulia*, which might have been the Names of Hobgoblins, for any thing the People understood by them. For let the worship be higher or lower, stronger or fainter, if it be a divine and religious Worship, it can lawfully be paid to none but God, and to give it to the Creature is to set them in God's place: Nor is it to any purpose; that they say,

say, they worship them not as Gods. For therein is their Crime the greater, that knowing and acknowledging them not to be Gods, they do give them that worship, which ought only to be paid to God. When therefore the Romanists tempt any to worship either Saints or Images or the like, I think it may be a fit answer to give them, which our Saviour gave to the Devil. *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve, (Mat. 4. 10.)* And if our Author could perswade us after all this, that these Things, are not imposed by that Church, I think, *Pius Quartus*, hath put it out of doubt, who with reference to this Explanation hath made it an Article of Faith in his Creed, which is not only to be profess'd but sworn to by all that return to their Communion, which every one must own in these Words, ' *Constanter teneo — Sanctos unà cum Christo regnantes venerandos atq; invocandos esse, eosq; orationes deo pro nobis offerre, atq; eorum reliquias esse venerandas; i. e. I stedfastly hold, that the Saints reigning together with Christ are to be worshiped and prayed to, and that they offer up Prayers to God for us, and that their reliques are to be worshipped.* I know the word *Venerandos* will bear another, and a milder Sense, but I translate it, *worshipped*, because both the Council of Trent, and the Catechisme direct us to that Sense, and *Pius Quartus* had a particular respect to them both in what he defined; and let them make what Pretences and Apologies they please to others, that is the Sense in which they would have those of their Communion to understand it; and therefore, that must be their true and real Sense.

Now how easie a matter is it for People to improve upon these Principles? And when those who are addicted to *Superstition*, and bred up, and encouraged in it, have such Grounds to build on, how far may they not go, or indeed where shall they stop? They pray oftner to the *Saints*, than to God himself; nay, they seem to trust more in *them* than in God; for one *Vow* you hear of made to God

in any distress, you shall hear of *ten* made to the *Virgin Mary*, and the *Saints*. And when they pray to *God*, it is often so, as shows, rather their Confidence in the *Saints*, than their trust in *God's* mercy and goodness through *Christ*. And this they are encouraged to by their allowed Offices; for instance at the end of the Breviary among the *propria Hispanorum* is this.

‘Exaudi, quæsumus Domine, preces nostras, quas
 ‘in Beati Ildefonsi Confessoris tui atq, Pontificis So-
 ‘lemnitate deferimus; & qui tibi digne meruit fa-
 ‘mulari, ejus intercedentibus meritis ab omnibus
 ‘nos absolve peccatis. per dominum nostrum; i. e.

*Hear, we pray thee O Lord, our Prayers, which we make
 unto thee in the Festival of Blessed Ildefonsus Bishop and
 Confessor; And he worthily deserving to serve thee, by
 the Intercession of his Merits, absolve us from all our
 Sins. And then after a full stop comes lag-
 ing behind. Through our Lord: And several others
 there are of the same stamp for Spanish use. But
 leaving them, I shall only cite one more out of the
 Offices appropriated to the Fryars Minors. ‘Deus,
 ‘qui sacram religionem Seraphici Francisci decorare
 ‘dignatus es triumpho multorum Martyrum pro
 ‘Christo occisorum, purissimisq; Pontificibus Bonaven-
 ‘tura & Ludovico, ac ferventissimis Jesu præconibus
 ‘Antonio & Bernardino, atque Didaco cum virgine
 ‘Clara. Præsta quæsumus, eorum intercessionibus
 ‘præsentia vitare pericula, & ad gaudia pervenire
 ‘Sempiterna; i. e. O God, who hast vouchsafed to
 adorn the sacred Religion of Seraphick Francis, with
 the Triumph of many Martyrs slain for Christ, and with
 the most pure Bishops Bonaventure and Ludovicus, and
 with the most Zealous Preachers of Jesus, Anthony,
 and Bernardine, and Didacus, together with the Virgin
 Clara; do thou make us, we pray thee, by their Inter-
 ceptions to escape present Dangers, and arrive at eternal
 Joys. And here for the honour of St. Francis, and
 his Religion (for so it is called, and not Christ's) the
 per Dominum nostrum is left out. And when such
 things are done according to the Rules of their holy
 Orders, what excess may not the Vulgar run into?*

And

And that they did so even with allowance and encouragement appears plainly from *Cassanders* complaint in these Words. ' *Hæc autem falsa & pernicioſa opinio, quantum in Vulgus invaluerit, nimis compertum eſt, exiſtmarunt enim homines improbi & in ſcleribus ſuis perdurantes, ſola ſanctorum (quos ſibi patrones deligerunt, & frigidis, ne dicam prophanis ceremoniis coluerunt) interceſſione & patrocinio veniam ſibi, & gratiam apud deum eſſe paratam: quæ pernicioſa opinio, quantum etiam fieri potuit, commentis miraculorum confirmabatur; i. e. It is too well known, how much this falſe and pernicious Opinion prevailed among the Vulgar. For wicked Men, and obſtinate Sinners, thought they obtained pardon for themſelves, and favour with God, by the Sole Interceſſion and Patronage of ſuch Saints, whom they choſe for their Patrons, and worſhipped with ſilly, that I ſay not prophane Ceremonies; which pernicious Opinion, as much as poſſibly could be, was confirmed by forged Miracles. Now it is well known, that they do not uſe to countenance the Plea of Miracles, but for ſuch Opinions and Practices as are the Darlings of their Church, and want proof other ways; and therefore this practice of the People had the Encouragement of the Church.*

But the burning ſhame and danger of this Practice appears no ways ſo predominant, as in the frequent Invocations, and extravagant Worſhip of the *Bleſſed Virgin*. Our Author himſelf confeſſeth that in the *Rosary*, there are *Ten Hail Mary's* for one *Lord's Prayer*. And this he acknowledgeth to be approved by the Church, and who expects more in ſuch a Caſe? For what occaſion is there for a Command with reſpect to private Devotion? The *Approbation* makes it as much a *Doctrine* of the Church as a *Command* could do. *Cassander* informs us, that the whole *Pſalter* was altered, and that where ever was the Name of our Lord, the Name of our Lady was put in the place of it: And what this is but to reject *Chriſt*, and ſet up his Mother in his ſtead? Others, and thoſe of no mean Note have divided the Kingdom between God and the bleſſed

fed Virgin; and whereas they make the Kingdom of God to consist of two Parts, *Judgment* and *Mercy*, that they may endear her the more, and set Men's Hearts chiefly upon her; they allot *Judgment* to God, but *Mercy* to *Mary*. And hence they take occasion to adorn her (who will never thank them for it) with glorious, I am unwilling to say blasphemous Tytles and Compellations, as *Queen of Heaven*. *Queen and Mother of Mercy*. *Our Life, our Hope, the Light of the Church*, our *Sollicitress* and *Mediatrice*, and the like, nay, this will not suffice them, unless *Christ* now reigning in heaven, and to whom all Power is given, both in Heaven, and in Earth, be made subject to his *Mother*, so that he shall be bound to do, whatsoever at their request she Commands, and this Doctrine is approv'd by Hymns publickly Sung in many of their Churches, as

*O Felix puerpera,
Nostra pians scelera
Fure Matris impera
Redemptori.*

and hence *Cassander* complains, that *Homines etiam non mali, &c.* That many otherwise, not ill Men did make choice of certain Saints to be their Patrons and Guardians, and put their trust more in their Intercession and Merits, than in the Merits of *Christ*, and so substituted the Saints, and the Blessed Virgin in the room of *Christ*, to the obscuring and depreciating his Mediatory Office. And ought these things to be Reform'd, or not? Or is it prudence to forsake a Church free from those Abuses, to run into one, where they are not only common, but these esteem'd the best *Catholicks*, who put them in Practice.

I make no question, but that the blessed *Angels*, and glorified *Saints* do wish well to us, but that they hear our *Prayers* to them, or are put into such Offices as we assign them, is a matter so utterly destitute of all good Evidence, that I understand not how such a Prayer can be made in Faith, which is a necessary Qualification for every *Christians Prayer*. For

to make them *Omniscient*, were to make them *Gods*; nor can they be in all *Places*, so that if *St. Peter* hear a Man praying to him at *Rome*, (and even of that he hath no certainty) it is certain he hears not another praying to him at the same time, who is in *London*, *Paris*, or the *Indies*. And to suppose that they know these Things by Revelation is altogether groundless. For if God do sometimes reveal some Things to them, it doth by means follow, that he doth so always, and in all Cases. Nor is it to any purpose to say that God *can* do this, unless we were assured of his *Will* to do it. For God can of these Stones make Bread; and yet, I do not think, that even a *Papist* would upon that Presumption oblige himself to *fast*, till he doth so. And at the best it is a very odd Employment, which they put upon God, that he must tell the Saints what we pray, that they may tell it him again, who knew it before. But when we address our selves immediately to God, the case is quite otherwise: For first, we are sure that we are in the right in so doing; it is our duty to put up our Supplications unto him, and then let us be where we will we are sure he hears us. Nor is there any difficulty or danger in this course; for he is more ready to hear, than we to pray; and further, if we pray as Christians ought to do, we are sure, that he not only hears our Prayers, but will grant our Requests; at least in such way and manner, as in his infinite Wisdom he knows to be best, and most convenient for us. God is not only Omniscient to know all things, and Omnipotent to do all things, but is of infinite Goodness and Mercy; so that we want no encouragement to go directly to him, nor need any other Intercessor but our Saviour, who is always ready; but where the Saints are, or what is their Power we know not; and as God is very willing and ready to give; so we can have what we pray for from no other hand; what we beg must be his Grant and Gift; and therefore one would think it might be enough to make any *Papist* blush to read that Saying
of

of *Jamblichus*, a *Heathen Philosopher*, ὅτι γέλοιον ποιεῖται οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἄλλοθεν πότεν ζητῶντες τὸ εὖ ἢ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, i. e. *That Men act a ridiculous part in requesting good Things other where than from God.* Here we are *safe* as to our *Duty*, *sure* as to our *Prayer*; but in our application to *Saints* unwarranted as to the *first*, uncertain as to the *last*.

To the *Objection*, that by this means they *forsake*, or at least *wrong the Mediatorship of Christ*; the *Essayer* answers, that it is a *Consequence*, which they expressly *disown*, and therefore according to his *fourth Rule*, we ought never to charge it upon them, and consequently it is a *Question*, which ought not to hinder *Communion*, but then what must they do, who do not *disown*, but acknowledge and dread the *Consequence*? Must they join in their *Communion*, whom they really believe in their *Worship* to be *injurious to the Saviour of Mankind*? Will anothers *Denyal* of a *Fault* acquit him, who confesseth himself *guilty*? If this were true, I see not how it tempts us to their *Communion*. For their *Denial* will not acquit those who confess. But must they not be charged with what they *disown*? If this would pass for a *Maxim*, certainly few would be found *guilty*. For who would not be *innocent*; if saying so would make him so? But the *Question* is not of what they say, but of what they Do. If their *Doings* and their *Sayings* agree not, by which shall we Judge? if you were *Tenant* to some great Person, and should pay half his *Rent* to him, and divide the other moyety among his more honourable and beloved *Servants*, do you think he would take this for payment? Or if he should sue for the whole, can you think the *Law* would judge this to be *satisfaction*, because you confidently vouched it to be so? Religious *Worship*, and devout *Prayers*, are *Rents* and *Services* which you owe to God the chief Lord; and if you force these upon others, and pay them where they are not due, will he allow you do him no wrong, because you say you do him none? When we come to give up our *Accounts* at the great and terrible Day of the Lord, will

will their saying they do no wrong pass for a good Plea, and secure us against the Sentence of the great Judge of Heaven and Earth? They may make what Judgment they will of *consequences*, and run what Dangers they please: I understand not the Wisdom of venturing *Eternal Salvation* upon such *Hazardous Terms*.

But though our Author confesses, that *there be many Abuses of this kind*, yet he saith, *they are no where imposed.* (p. 59.) What matters it whether they be imposed or not, if they be allowed and approved? That is Encouragement enough; but I desire to know what it differs from an *Imposition*, when the Priest is enjoined to instruct his *Parishioners*, with respect to *Saints and Images*, *is honorem & cultum adhibere*, i. e. not only to Honour but Worship them, which is the express Direction of the Catechism. But further he tells us, that the Council of Trent, recommended to the Prelates to be watchful, in taking away all Superstition in the Invocation of Saints, and other Abuses in keeping of their Holy-Days. True indeed, as to some such shameful Abuses, which they could not in Modesty Patronize; but not, as to the Abuses, which we complain of; and even therein the Prelates are tyed up to such hard conditions, that their Authority seems to be of little or no Force; for in conclusion of the Decree, this restraint is laid upon the Exercise of their Authority, *ita tamen, ut nihil inconsulto Sanctissimo Romano Pontifice novum, aut in Ecclesia hactenus inusitatum decernatur*, i. e. So, that without consulting the most Holy Bishop of Rome, they ordain nothing new, or which hath not been hitherto used in the Church. (Con Triden. sess. 25th.) What therefore had been used, might still be used: They had not Power to Innovate or Determine any thing new; but he still further Urgeth, That Books published by Authority, mention these very Abuses, and condemn them with as much Severity, as any of our Church can possibly do: It is well if it be true; but then the greater is their Shame, and the more evident their Obstinacy; that notwithstanding

all this; these things are not amended; and even in this matter he refers us only to two *French Treatises*; and it is well known that the Generality of the *French*, are look'd on at *Rome*, as a loose Sort of *Catholicks*, and that the best and ablest of their Writers agree so much with us, that the Pope hath a very ill Opinion of them for it; and if it lay in his power, would put a Bridle in their Jaws; but even there among the *Regulars*, and such, over whom his *Holyness* hath a greater Influence, *Superstition* and *Abuses* flourish, well nigh as much as in other Places; for a Testimony whereof I shall only cite a *Tetrastick*, which was to be seen on the Walls of the *Capuchin's Cloyster* at *Angers* in *Anjou*, and Copied thence by a Person now Living:

Exue Franciscum tunicâ lacerôque cucullo.

Qui Franciscus erat, nunc modo Christus erit:
Indue sed Christum Capucinâ Veste, quid inde?

Hic Franciscus erit, qui modo Christus erat.

it is therefore to little purpose to tell us, that some are *Offended* at such things, and others *write* against them, whilst they are either *approved* or *indulged* by *Ecclesiastical Authority*, let us see them amended and really removed, and then we may have some good Opinion of them; till then, we think not fit to trust our selves with them.

Notwithstanding all this, our Author will needs persuade us, that *Invocation* is in this Matter, the only single point, which wants to be accommodated between the two Churches, I think the contrary hath been already made appear; but suppose it so, what will he do then? Why, then the *Reconciliation* is easy; for he thinks *Bishop Mountague* (who was indeed a most Learned Person, and shining Light in our own Church) hath as good as done the matter to our hands, and, as he cites him, he makes him to grant three things, 1st. *That the Saints in Heaven pray for the faithful on Earth*, and what if he had said the *unfaithful* too? For I doubt not, but that
their

their Charity is so great, that they wish all Men might be saved, and come to the Knowledge of the truth. 2ly. *That the blessed in Heaven, do recommend to God in their Prayers, their Kindred, Friends, and Acquaintance on Earth:* And all this, their good Will and tender Affection for them may prompt them to do, though they know nothing at all of their State and Condition, as we may learn from the Church's Address to God, *Doubtless thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not.* (Isa. 63. 16.) 3ly. *That it is no Injury to the Mediation of Christ, to ask of the Saints to pray for us;* but here he makes a little too bold with the Bishop, even according to his own citation of him; for he allows this only under certain Limitations and Restraints; *could, (saith he) I come at them, or certainly inform them of my State, were they with me, by me, in my kenning,* then he would do so and so; that is, were the Case, as to them, any thing like that with Men on Earth, (who are bound and taught to pray for one another) to whom we can make known our Affairs, and the minutest Circumstances of them; and who we are sure know what we request of them; but this he denies, as to the Saints departed, and that spoils all; and indeed I think the Essayer hath shewed himself to be a Man of no mean Confidence, who durst adventure to cite that *learned Bishop* in this case; for though, to prevent unnecessary Disputes, he makes what Concessions he could, yet then he falls on them so strongly, closely and severely, that there is not a *lurking hole*, out of which he doth not ferret them; he doth not leave them so much as a twig to save themselves from drowning: And if any will please to read over that his learned and complete Treatise, *Of the Invocation of Saints*, he will quickly be satisfied, that if our Author will stand to the Bishop's *Umpirage*, he must give up his Cause.

I have now done with this Particular; and to follow him through every Head of his Discourse,

would be too tedious, and indeed needless; for if we Instance in any, which are a just Barr against their Communion, those are sufficient to justify us, and we need not trouble others, or our selves further. I shall therefore pass over to his eleventh and twelfth Chapter, where he treats something both of *Scripture* and *Tradition*; but he doth it so lightly and confusedly, as if he had a mind to drop the main Question: And therefore it will be requisite, first, to enquire what they mean by *Scripture* and *Tradition*, and of what Authority each are with them? And if it herein appear, that they impose such things upon us, as are false in themselves, dishonourable to God, tend to corrupt the whole Church, and such as no Christian ought to allow or comply with; then I think this Author not only may, but ought to spare his Pains, in endeavouring to decoy us into their Communion: His time had been much better spent in exhorting and pressing them to a Reformation; but though that would have been more Christian, yet I think it would have been to finall purpose, because their Politicks considered there is no hope of it, till Force and Necessity shall have a greater Influence on them than Persuasion. But that we may return to our Business, by Traditions they mean such as are unwritten, which they make *tum ad fidem tum ad mores pertinere*, i.e. to extend both to Faith and Manners; and if any such remain, of which there is no account in Writing, they are tolerably thus described by them, *que ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptæ, aut ab ipsis Apostolis, Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus tradita, ad nos usque pervenerunt*, i.e. Such as the Apostles received from the mouth of Christ, or were delivered by the Apostles from the Dictates of the Holy Spirit, and from them handed down to our times. And again, *ore tenus à Christo vel à Spiritu Sancto dictatus, & continuâ Successione in Ecclesiâ catholicâ conservatus*, i.e. Such as came from the Mouth of Christ, or were dictated by the Holy Spirit, and by a continued Succession preserved in the Catholic Church. Thus they describe them, but thus they

they will not stand to them; for at this rate *Traditions* must not only spring from a *firm* and *infallible Original*, but must have the *Concurrent Testimony* of all *Ages*, *Persons*, and *Places* in the *Church*; and if many of their *traditional Doctrines* were put upon this *Trial*, they would quickly be discovered to be *Impositions*; and we shall see presently, that in this very *Decree* they depart from it, yea, decree directly against it; but they have a *Remedy* for this, for, by confining the *Judgment* of what is *Tradition* to their *present Church*, they supersede all further *Enquiry*, and make themselves *absolute Masters*, not only of *Tradition*, but of the *Scriptures* also; so that you must have no *Scripture*, but what they acknowledge; and must believe every thing to be a *Tradition*, which they say is so. By this means, they have usurped an *Authority*, to impose upon us what they please for *Doctrines*, both of *Faith* and *Manners*; and furnished themselves with an *Argument*, to prove it beyond all *Contradiction*; for it is but saying there is a *Tradition*, and there must be no further *Dispute* of it: This is a quick and easy way of ending of *controverses*; but then again this *Unhappiness* attends it, that when *Men* are not so weak and foolish to be over ruled by it, it creates more; but for those who can be so easily dealt with, they have imposed upon them sufficiently, and trump'd up so many unwarrantable and dangerous *Doctrines*, that what our blessed Saviour said to the *Pharisees* may be truly turned upon them, *that they have made the Commandment of God of none effect by their Traditions*, (*Matt. 15. 6.*)

When they have described their *Traditions*, they next tell us of what *Authority* they are; and no less will satisfy them, than to make them equal with the *Scriptures*, for with respect to both, they say, *pari pietatis affectu, & reverentia suscipit, et veneratur*, i.e. *The Council receives and Honours both with an equal pious Affection and Regard*. This is a bold Stroke; for *Traditions* may by design be corrupted; and

and then they serve only to deceive us; or by Weakness and Misunderstanding *mistaken*, and so *misreported*, and thereby *altered*; or by *negligence* may be *lost*, and then can be of no Use; but none of these things can befall the *Scriptures*; for though Men misunderstand them in any thing, and make Mistakes, yet the *Scriptures* continue the same; Men's misapprehensions make no change in them, and for this end seem the *Scriptures* to be written, to supply the Defect of *Tradition*, and to prevent our being *imposed* upon by *mistaken* or *false Traditions*; and therefore we have reason to suspect, that this Determination was made with this Design, that it might be of standing Use, at any time upon Occasion, to put a cheat upon us, and sham us off with *pretended Tradition*, where Scripture failed or was against them; for what reason else cou'd there be, to make *Tradition*, at such a distance of time, and thorough so many dark and corrupt Ages, equal to the Holy *Scriptures*.

I make no question but our *Saviour* and his *Apostles* taught the same things by word of *mouth*, which were afterwards committed to *writing*, but to what end were they committed to *writing*, unless to preserve and secure to succeeding Times what had been taught by word of *mouth*? and if so, then they must be the *Standard*, by which any *pretended Traditions* must be tryed; and if this be so, then they cannot be of *equal Authority* with the *Scriptures*, or at least, we cannot *equally* depend upon them. If any thing can be made appear to have been approved and received by the *Universal Church* down from the *Apostles times*, it is impossible but that it must either have some Foundation in *Scripture*, or at least is not disagreeable to it, and in such case I should never scruple to admit it; but there will be few of those things found, which in their own Nature are of any great Moment: but this is not the quarrel, nor can it lead us into an Error; but what they vouch may lead us into endless Error, to the dishonour and detriment of our *Holy Religion*, and our

our danger. For when they make *Tradition* of equal Authority with the *Scriptures* both as to *Faith* and *Manners*, they set up *two Rules*, and both of *equal Authority*. Now I would know, whether either of these *Rules* be *perfect*? for if one be *perfect*, there is no need of the other, *quatenus a Rule*; and if the *Scripture* be not a *perfect Rule*, then not only the *Scriptures*, but all the *Fathers*, who unanimously assert the *perfection* of the *Scriptures*, and consequently *Tradition* it self, have led us into a *dangerous Error*; and so we can neither depend on *Scripture* or *Tradition*, but both at once are cashiered. Doth not this make an admirable provision for Christians? and is it not a valuable *Communion*, which hath no *certain Rule* to walk by? That they accuse the *Scriptures* of *imperfection* shall presently appear. Now on the other hand, suppose the *Rules* not so perfect, but that they must supply what is wanting to each other. What if it so happen that they prescribe things contradictory? Is not my Obedience then become impossible? For I cannot observe one Rule without violating the other; I cannot do what the one Commands, but it will be a Transgression of what the other forbids: and thus my Duty is rendred impracticable, and in consequence, my Salvation unattainable: as thus, The *Scripture* in exprefs terms, frequently forbids the *worship of Images*; they place *Images* in their *Churches*, and the *Priest* is commanded to give it among his Instructions to the People, *ut colantur*, that they are to be worshipped: now if I *worship*, I act directly contrary to *Scripture*; if I *do not*, I am *condemned* by *Tradition*, or what other *Authority* they set up for that purpose. But it is needless here to speak of the *Authority* of any *Councils* in this case; because let *Councils* define what they please, they must do it upon the *Authority* of one of these Two, or both, *Scripture* and *Tradition*, unless they pretend to a new *Revelation*. Seeing then that no Man is necessitated to Sin, and yet in this case, I cannot extricate my self from it, there is this only way left to escape, that
in

in such hardships one have the *preheminnence* over the other : but then this utterly overthrows the *equality* of their *Authority*, yea often wholly *vacates* the *Authority* of the one : and yet this is really what they stick to, notwithstanding this pretence of *equality*. For what scandalous Titles do their most approved Authors give to *Scripture* with respect to *Tradition*, or the *Church Authority*? and where one would think they should be more cautious, even at our own doors, and at this very time, one of them *in terminis*, denies the *Scripture* to be a *Rule of Faith* : nay, when they come to the *Authority* of the *Scripture*, do not they make it to depend upon the *Authority* of *Tradition* or the *Church*? and yet neither *Tradition* nor the *Church* have herein any greater *Authority* than that of a *Witness*. Now a *Witness* doth not make that true, which he speaks ; but he is therefore a true *Witness*, because he declares that, which was in it self true antecedently to his *Testimony*. Hence you may perceive, that whatever they pretend, they never intended to put *Scripture* in equal ballance with *Tradition*, but their great design was to advance *Tradition*, that under colour of that, they might as occasion serv'd defend or impose *Doctrines* disallowed by *Scripture*.

This is the more unsufferable, because *Tradition* as it respects *Scripture* is only *Testimonial* and of *humane Authority*, it is only the concurrent *Testimony* of all *Christian Churches* of what *Books* Men inspired by the Holy Ghost wrote, and left with them for a standing *Rule* in all ages. The *Books* themselves are of *Divine Authority*, as being written by Men inspired : but *Tradition* is not all along so, but only a *Witness* which were such *Books* ; it doth not make them so, but receives and hands down those which were so before. Now when the *Romanists* first equalize the *Authority* of *Scripture* and *Tradition*, and then make *Scripture* receive its *Authority* from *Tradition*, and confine that *Tradition* within the present *Roman Church*, they make her not only *Mistress* of all *Churches*, but also of the
Faith

Faith it self; so that she may give what she will for *Tradition*, and what she pleaseth for *Books of Scripture*, and she may enlarge the *Canon*, or lessen or destroy it, as her interest shall perswade her. And certainly no Christian Church ought to suffer this, who hath any reverence for and esteem of Gods Holy Word, or any concern for our Common Christianity.

My present business is not with *Tradition* as to other matters, but with *Tradition* as it respects *Scripture*: and in this case we have a fair Specimen of what they may attempt hereafter from what they have done already. For in reckoning up the Books of the *Old Testament*, they make the additions to *Hester* and *Daniel*, the Books of *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Tobit*, *Judith*, *Baruch*, and the *Macchabees*, as *Canonical* as any of the rest. And this these extollers of *Tradition* do contrary to the *Tradition* of the *Universal Church* in this very case, even while they pretend to settle its Authority, they set it at defiance. What bounds can be set to Men, who will dare thus? We can have no other *Canon* of the *Old Testament*, but what we received from the *Jews*, for unto them were committed the *Oracles of God*, *Rom. 3. 2.* and those Books were never received into their *Canon*, as others have abundantly proved. Nor were they translated into *Greek* by the 72. whatever others may have since palm'd upon them. *S. Paul* tells us that we are built upon the foundation of the *Apostles and Prophets*, (*Eph. 2. 20.*) but the *Prophets* ended with *Malachi*, and these Books were written after, and it is not improbable that one or two of them were written about the time of *Christ*, if not after, and how could these be in the *Canon*? Further the Authors of these Books are either Men utterly unknown, or very uncertain, or at best much short of the reputation of Men inspired. Nay the Authors themselves are not reconcileable with their Decree, and that Bible, which with them is Authentick, in effect condemns it. For the Author of the second Book of

Macchabees in the close of his History, thus apologizeth for himself and his performance, as it is in the Vulgar Latin. *Et si quidem bene, & ut historia competit, hoc & ipse velim: si autem minus digne, concedendum est mihi: i. e. If I have done well, and as became the History, it is what I desired; but if less deservingly, you must pardon me. (2 Mac. 15. 39.)* and is this like an inspired Writer? what could be said more by a common Historian to express a sense and apprehension of his own failing? If from hence we come to the *Christian Church*, there you have a cloud of Witnesses of all Ages against this Decree. Part of these Books, as also of some other, such as *Hermas's Pastor*, might be read some times for Edification and instruction in *Manners*; but they were of no Authority for proof of Doctrines of Faith, and expressly excluded out of the Canon; and this is so fully proved by the Reverend and Learned Bishop *Cosins*, and all their Objections clearly answered, that I should only light a Candle to the Sun in coming after him: and therefore if any desire further satisfaction in this matter, I must recommend them to his *Scholastical History of the Canon of the Holy Scripture*.

Yet all this nothing moves them, but that they might at once triumph over the *Holy Scriptures*, over all *Churches* both *Jewish* and *Christian*, and over their own darling *Tradition* it self, they are not content only to define these Books to be *Canonical*, but they denounce an *Anathema* against all those, who receive them not as such. And is it not an irresistible Temptation to go over to their *Communion*, that they will deliver me over to *Satan*, and to their Power send me packing to *Hell*, unless I will believe that to be True, which the Saints in Heaven while on Earth, and all the Churches of God all along deny'd? Had the Council of *Trent* power to make that True, which they thought False? or doth the Faith and its Rule vary at the pleasure of Men? But further, the manner how these Books are to be received for *Canonical*, deserves

to be well observed: For the Decree runs thus, *Siquis autem libros ipsos integros cum omnibus suis partibus prout in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ legi consueverunt, & in Veteri vulgatâ latinâ editione habentur, pro Sacris & Canonicis non susceperit; & traditiones prædictas sciens & prudens contempserit, Anathema sit, i. e.* If any man shall not receive these same Books entire with all their parts, as they are wont to be read in the Catholick Church, and are contained in the Old Vulgar Latin Edition, for Sacred and Canonical; and knowingly and wittingly shall despise the aforesaid Traditions, let him be Anathema. This bids fair to exclude the Originals, or render them useles. For here not only Books are made Canonical, which were never so before, but we are obliged to receive them for Canonical, as they are in the Old Vulgar Latin Edition, and to that purpose in the following part of the Decree it is made *Authentick*. Now the *Vulgar Latin* is no more than a *Translation*, and though not despisable in it self, yet was made up at several Times by several Persons, and therefore comes a long time after the *Original*, when there was actually no such thing as Inspiration in the Church, and consequently can be no more *Authentick* than other Translations further than as it agrees with the Original better than they do. For properly and strictly none are *Authentick* but the *Original*, and yet if this at any time contradicts or agrees not with the *Original*, we must follow that, and not the *Original*, which is truly *Authentick*; and so if we are deceived by it must be without remedy. But further, that which was decreed to be *Authentick* was the *OLD Vulgar Latin*, and the *Text* of what is *Authentick* ought not in the least to be altered or changed, nor can it be done without derogating from its *authenticallness*: and yet *Sixtus Quintus* corrected and amended this *authenticall Bible* in some hundreds of Places, and the like did *Clement the VIIIth.* after him. Now the *Old Vulgar Latin* being decreed *Authentick*, must not *Sixtus Quintus's Bible* be more *Authentick* than that, and *Clement the VIIIth.*

more Authentick than them both? But the mischief of it is, that by this means, we cannot be certain which is *Authentick*; and the *Old Vulgar Latin*, which was decreed to be *Authentick*, being either lost, or by reason of these Emendations, in danger to be so, instead of getting more Books than we had before into the *Canon*, we are in a fair way to lose the *Whole Bible*; for when we are enjoined to receive certain Books as *Canonical*, as they are in such an Edition, and that Edition is either lost, or we cannot certainly know which it is, what is it that we can receive?

To enjoyn us to receive Books for *Canonical*, which are not so; and to receive them in such a manner, as we neither ought nor can receive them, are such discouraging conditions, as would make any one avoid, rather than embrace such a *Communion*; but it is still worse, for whether you can receive them or not, you must receive them, or shall be *Anathema*; that is in plain English, be *Damn'd*: A dreadful Sentence for that which is no fault, but rather a Duty. For to receive Books for *Canonical*, which are not *Canonical*, is to falsify the Charter of Heaven, to *Usurp God's Authority*, to make that a *Rule* which he never did; and therefore no good Man ought to comply with it: And if we must be *damn'd* for this, how shall we be *Saved*? But who must this fearful Judgment fall upon? Indeed if they may do and determine what they List, the Case is altered; but if their Sentence take its Force from the nature of the thing, and the Crime deserving it be not receiving such Books, why should they not suffer for it, who went before us, as well as we that come after? If they are *Canonical now*, they were *Canonical then*; for no Books can be *Canonical*, but what were written by Men *inspired* for that purpose; and if they were so, they were *always Canonical*; if not, no *Council* whatsoever can make them *Canonical now*; and if we ought to receive them now, they ought not to have rejected them before; and why should not the same Crime have the same Punishment

ment in one as well as another; and if we be *Guilty*, how can they be *Innocent*? Now no Man more plainly and cleerly excludes *these Books* out of the *Canon*, than *St. Jerom*; and he is generally followed by those who come after; and had as good Men of the same mind that went before him; and if it be *Damnable* in us, not to receive these Books as *Canonical*, will not they fall under the same condemnation, who lead us the way, did the same thing, and are our Authorities for what we do now? And doth not this Sentence in the consequence plainly condemn them? But hold; these Men by the Confession of the *Papists* themselves, are now *glorified Saints*; and must we be sent to *Hell* for the very same Crime they were guilty of, and never repented it, who are now in *Heaven*? Or will they undertake to Condemn those, whom God hath Acquitted? This they plainly do, if there be any force in their Decree. Is not this a rare *damning Church*? How do they overflow with Charity? Who would not Essay to get into such a *Communion*, or out of it? for the *Essayer* shall go thither alone by himself for me.

This horrid Abuse, and dangerous Violence offered to the *Canon of Holy Scripture*, the *Essayer* glides over as lightly, as if it were not worth taking notice of; but for *Breeding People in Ignorance*, *Prayers in an unknown Tongue*, and *prohibiting the Bible*, he can make an excellent Defence: The first he denies, and tells us, *the Church of Rome is both desirous and Sollicitous, that all in her Communion should be duly instructed in all Duties which belong to Salvation; especially in the Commandments, in the Creed, in the Sacraments, in the Lord's Prayer.* (p. 168.) This is more boldly, than truly said. In those *English Catechisms* of theirs, which I have seen, the *Second Commandment* is wholly left out, and even the *Trent Catechism* cuts it short, when it relates the fourth, (with them the third) at large; and why this Partiality to the one more than the other? I do not think it worth while to Quarrel about the Division of

of the Commandments, though I approve not theirs; but suppose what we call the *Second* be part of the *First*, doth not that part so carefully guard against *Idolatry* and *False Worship*, that it is fit it should be known? And for what Reason it is concealed I cannot imagine; unless it be, least the People should discover something in their *Worship*, which by that Commandment is plainly forbidden. But if it were not so, what have they to do to *erase* out that which was written with the *Finger of God*? will they have the same Power over the Commandments, as over the *Sacraments*, and teach the one by the Halves, as they Administer the other? Is this their *especial Instructing* them in the Commandments?

But suppose they do Instruct them in the Principles of the Christian Religion, do not they give them such other Instructions as spoil all again? Are they not ty'd up to their Instructions, and obliged to take every thing upon their Credit? They must believe and act just as they are taught, and must not see with their own Eyes, nor make use of their own Understandings; for why else is the Bible prohibited? Some will say there is danger, that the Common People may Abuse it; but if that be all, it is what the best of them actually do; and so may be a reason to take it from the Priest as well as the People; but are not therein the *Words of Eternal Life*? And must we be kept from them? Was it not our Saviour's own Direction to *Search the Scriptures*? But you will say that was spoken to the *Jews*. True; but were not the *Scriptures* written for our Instruction as well as theirs? Are they not a *Rule* to us as much as to them? And have not we the same *Right to them*, which they had? But at last he tells us, that there are Bibles in the *Vulgar Tongue*. *The Gallican Church is abundantly provided with Several Versions.* (p. 177.) And do they not abound too in *Spain and Italy*? It is well known that Church will take more liberty than the Pope is willing to allow; and if he
were

were able to hinder it, it should be otherwise. But (saith he) There is an *English Translation of the Holy Bible, made, and printed by the Roman Catholicks at Doway and Rhemes*. We know it very well, and that it was purposely done to affront our *Translation*, and keep up some of their own *peculiar Terms*; but how many of these have you seen in the hands of the *Vulgar*? This was done to spite us, not to instruct them: and though it may serve for a colour, yet shall be of no use to the common sort.

For the *Publick Service* of the Church to be in an *unknown Tongue*, he can find abundance of *Precedents*; but there is a *Precedent* beyond them all, which is *Authentick*, which we are bound to stand to; this he thought fit to forget or overlook; but I shall direct him to it, he may find it in the first *Epistle to the Corinthians, cap. 14.* there *St. Paul* tells us, *That except ye utter by the tongue words easie to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak unto the air.* And again, *If I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh, a Barbarian; and he that speaketh shall be a Barbarian unto me, (v. 11.)* Again, *Seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the Church, (v. 12.)* No doubt but People are abundantly edified, when they understand not a Word what is said. Again, *How shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest? (v. 16.)* *Amen* was to be said by the People as implying their concurrence, consent and approbation; which seems founded on that Command in the Old Law, (*Deut. 27. 15.*) For doing which, it was necessary in *St. Paul's* sence, that they should understand what was said, but how to reconcile this to the *Roman Practice* I understand not. Indeed the greatest part of that Chapter directly condemns *Publick Offices* in an *Unknown Tongue*, and prescribes the contrary. And therefore till our *Essayer* shall have confuted *St. Paul*, I shall not think his unhappy

Prece-

Precedents worth taking notice of, otherwise than as *Transgressions*. But this he thinks ought not to break the Peace, because it is only a matter of *Discipline*, and subject to alteration. And thus he makes it a thing indifferent, whether the People understand or not; and lays in an excellent reserve for *Rome*, that if at any time she grant it, she may take it away again at pleasure, and so (to use his own Phrase) leave the People to be at Prayers like so many Statues without sense or understanding. But still he hopes on, that the other side, (i.e. the Roman) upon the motive of a publick Good, may be prevail'd on to allow of a Change; as was done in favour of the New Church in CHINA. (p. 171, 2.) But then by his own Confession, it was quickly left off again; and as for us, we need not their allowance, we have it already, and hold it by Right and Apostolical Authority. To what purpose then should we go over to them to compound for it, and when we have done, be always in danger of losing it?

I cannot think otherwise, but that you are sufficiently tired with such a tedious Letter; and yet I shall beg your Patience to trouble you with a brief Consideration of one thing more; and that is, the Communion in one kind. That it was administered in both kinds even in the Latin Church for above a Thousand Years, our Author himself confesseth; and I cannot think of any inconvenience which is since pretended against that Practice, which might not have been pleaded before: and why should they prevail more to discontinue it now, than they did then? I acknowledge that he produceth many extraordinary instances, which may seem to favour Communion in one kind; but that they are of little or no force, you may perceive from these Considerations, First, that Extraordinary Examples are to be left for the like Extraordinary Cases, but ought not to be made the ordinary and standing Rule and Practice. For if you take this course all the common and ordinary Rules may

may be overthrown, and we left in uncertainty and confusion. Secondly, This was never done, but when it could not, or not easily be done otherwise; and though much may be allowed to necessity, yet what is this to the Publick? Besides this was not done, but (as Cassander well observes) when that blessed Sacrament was received *non ad representationem, sed ad efficaciam tantum, i. e.* For the sake of the benefit, not upon the account of the representation, but the public Administration being always *ad representationem* as well as *ad efficaciam*, it is a good Argument; that it ought therefore there to be administered in both kinds. Thirdly, I do not find by any of those Instances, that it was ever deliver'd purely in one kind, for either there was intinction into the Blood, or aspersion of the Blood on the other Element; and so there was the substance of both kinds, though by reason of the infirmness or incapacity of the Receiver, they were not administered after the ordinary manner: and thus there is only a variation in Circumstance, and that in an extraordinary Case, and so those very instances make more against them, than for them.

But that he may by any means deprive the Layety of the Cup, he makes use of an Argument peculiar to the Romanists. For though he acknowledge, *drink ye all* of this to be a plain Command, yet he saith, it is to those, to whom Christ spoke them, that is, to the Apostles, (and to their successors) whom he then made Priests, and gave them power to consecrate the Elements, as he had done; for that as the Power of consecrating, which Christ then gave to the Apostles, is not to be extended to the Layety, so neither the Command of drinking, (p. 116, 7.) I do not think it worth my while to dispute it with him, whether the Apostles were then made Priests, it is an odd Notion; but if *drink* was said only to the Apostles, why not *eat*? Both were said at the same Time, in the same Circumstances, and with the same Intention. And if the Reception of the Sacrament was restrained only to the Priesthood, I see not

what obligation the *Layety* lie under to receive it; or the *Priest* to give it them; and so they may take the *Bread* from them as well as the *Wine*. And I would willingly know what benefit the Reception of it can be unto them, if in the *Institution* it was not intended for them: and then what will become of all those gracious Eulogies the Ancients give of this Holy Sacrament? And to what purpose are their pressing and warm Exhortations to the frequent receiving it? Were all those *Corinthians Priests*, to whom St. Paul said, *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup.* (1 Cor. 11. 28.) St. Paul directs his Speech to the whole Body of the *Corinthian Church*, and supposeth it a duty in all with due Preparation to receive; and I hope he may be allowed to understand our Saviour's meaning much better than any of these *Roman Interpreters*; and if they will leave of their tricking and juggling, neither Scripture nor Tradition will favour this their New Doctrine, but both give in Evidence against it.

To conclude, This Blessed Sacrament is a positive Ordinance, and so the Benefit of it depends entirely upon the *Institution*, and that and no other can be the Sacrament so beneficial to us, but what Christ instituted for that purpose. Now to make up this Sacrament our Saviour instituted both *Bread* and *Wine*; they are the parts, which make up the whole: and if you use not both these, you administer not his *Institution* but your own *Invention*. The memory of his Passion cannot be represented without both; our complete Spiritual Nutrition is not intimated to us but by receiving both: and therefore in our Prayer of Consecration we say thus, *grant that we receiving these thy Creatures of Bread and Wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy Institution, in remembrance of his Death and Passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood.* As Drink as well as Bread is necessary for our bodily Refreshment and Nourishment, so both Elements are made here necessary
for

for the support of our Souls: One alone is not what Christ instituted; and how can the Promises and Benefits be appropriated to any thing but what Christ instituted? He assigns not such Benefits to the Bread alone separately, or the Wine alone separately, but to both in Conjunction, as making up the whole *Institution*. And therefore seeing the *Romanists* will not give the *Layety* what Christ instituted, I leave it to them to give them satisfaction, whether what they administer to them be really a *Sacrament* or not.

For two Reasons, I shall not at this time pursue this Author any further, *First*, Because (which I intimated before) it is to no purpose to dispute particular *Doctrines*, till the points of *Infallibility* and *Supremacy* are settled. For while they pertinaciously adhere to either of them, there is no room for dispute about other matters: but if they will give them up, (of which there is small hope) we are willing to discourse the rest in a calm and Christian Way, and come to an agreement upon Reasonable Terms. My other Reason is, Because it would be an unnecessary Labour, as being done already to our hands. For you may remember the time, when a bold *Romanist* put forth a Treatise, Entitled, *A Papist misrepresented and represented*, wherein all, or most of these *Doctrines* are handled; and if you please to read the Answers thereto, I think you will not need much further satisfaction. Only I must do this Author that Justice, as to own, that he, who professeth himself a *Protestant*, hath in behalf of the *Church of Rome*, much outdone the other, who boasted himself to be a *Papist*; though the former wrote, when a King of that unhappy Persuasion was on the Throne; and this writes, when he hath no temptation to it, unless he thinks to be meritorious by a voluntary and unseasonable wading so far in their Cause.

I will trouble you no further saying with one Remark; and I am sorry there should be so much

ill nature or malice in any, who call themselves Christians, as to give occasion for it. There is a Body of Men, for their number contemptible, who nevertheless are by some Persons thought too honest to be suffered to live in the World; and upon that account they catch at all opportunities to expose them to trouble and danger; and if any thing be distasteful or invidious, right or wrong it is charg'd upon them. It is not very long since a *Small but Bloody Treatise* was wrote by a then nameless Author, Entituled *The Shortest way with the Dissenters*; This no sooner came abroad, but presently it was fathered upon the *Nonjurors*; and those, who had learnt by their own sufferings to commiserate others, were represented as a most cruel and barbarous sort of Men; insomuch that it began to be dangerous for them to walk the Streets. I could name the Man who had not then seen the Book, and yet in the open Streets, was accused to be the Author of it by a Messenger, and I believe had fallen into trouble for it, had it not been happily discovered, that it was Written by one *Daniel Foe*, a Zealous Republican Whigg, and a High-Flyer among that Party. This Danger is no sooner well over, but up starts another: This unknown Essay-maker, who makes insinuating and scandalous Proposals for Catholick Communion; and whatever he design'd, the effect is this, that it is generally judg'd to be Written by a Nonjuror in disguise; and now nothing more certain than what they were Slandered with before, that they are Papists, or Popishly affected; and this may serve to set the Mob upon them at the next opportunity. This is a hard Case, that Men shall be ruined, and driven from their own Homes; and when they are in a manner worn out with Age and Troubles, shall not be suffered with their contented Poverty and a good Conscience to slide quietly into their Graves. I ought to be allowed to know the sense of these Men better than others, who are not of them; and I do say, that they are farther from Popery than their Accusers, of any Denomination whatsoever; and if

if it might be put to a fair Tryal, I make no doubt, but that it would plainly appear, that their Principles are better fitted, to withstand and keep out *Popery*, than any of these Men's, who raise such False, Scandalous, and Malicious Reports, purposely to render a parcel of poor undone Men *Odi-ous*. I must confess, that I am still of opinion, that a more *Christian way* might have been made choice of, to keep out *Popery*, than the Course which was taken, when it directly Assaulted us; but if it had come in then, we must have *lost all*, because we could not in conscience have comply'd with it; and now we have *lost all*, because we cannot in conscience fall in with other Mens Methods; So that what Course soever had prevailed, we must have unavoidably been *undone*, and are so. This is a Case of no mean Difficulty and Hardship; and yet, as hard as it is, when God pleaseth to call to Tryals, those who will be *Christians indeed*, must not shrink, but choose rather to take up their *Cross*, and follow *Christ*, than suffer themselves to be misled by the *Humours* of the *World*, though to enjoy all the *Advantages* of it; but it is a most miserable Case, that after all these Hardships, we are not suffered to be our *Selves*; but are represented to be what we are not; and exposed to the *Rage* of the *People* in such *Shapes* as are not our own; which is little better Usage, than the *Primitive Christians* had from *Heathens*, who sewed them up in *Bear-Skins*, and then baited them with *Dogs*. But the strangest thing of all is, and which, if we did not see it, would exceed Belief, that after all this, a Motion should be *publicly* made, that *Popery* should have a free and general *Admittance* by *Common Consent*; for that is the plain design of the *Essay-maker*; and if nothing else will serve their turns, (which for my part, whatever befalls me, I shall never consent to.) I think they might as well have let it come in quietly before because it might have saved the loss of many thousand Mens *lives*, and the expence of some *Millions* of *Treasure*; but we shall not mete the same

same measure to others, which hath been measured to us. What hath been falsely supposed to be written by one of us, hath been unjustly charged upon all, as if it had the approbation of all: But though this Author be in *Church preferment*, yet I am far from being of Opinion, that he hath many therein of the *same mind*; much less that the *Great Person*, from whom he pretends to have borrowed his *Six Rules*, ever dream'd that they would have been wrested to that *ill use*, which this *Audacious Essayer* hath made of them; yet there are a Sort of Men, whose Censures seldom overabound with Candor, or Charity, and are glad of such Occasions as these to *bespatter* even the *Innocent*; it may therefore concern them to take some Care and Pains to clear themselves, least as loud a bawling out of *Popery* be raised against them, as hath been industriously tho' undeservedly spread against others; as for our selves, having nothing left us but our *Reputation*, I hope it cannot be imputed to us as a Crime, if we are unwilling to part with it; and endeavour to vindicate it from *False Reports* and *Calumnies*; but if it be resolved, that we must be endlessly pursued with *Rancour* and *Malice*, *Lies* and *Slanders*, our Comfort is, that we have the Examples of the best of Men, who have suffered the same before us; and we think it much better to be *ill-spoken of*, and *hardly used*, than to *deserve* either.

S I R,

I fear I have quite worn out your Patience; but if I have, you may thank your self for setting me to work: when at your leisure you peruse this, if it should prove so satisfactory to you, that you think it may be Beneficial to others, you may make it as Publick as you please; and let the Success be what it will, I shall not complain of wrong done me, who am,

S I R

Your Old Faithful Friend, &c.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

A LETTER from a Countrey Justice to an Alderman in the City, occasioned by the Bishop of *Sarum's* Speech against the Bill for *Occasional Conformity*. Price 6 d.

The Mask of Moderation pull'd off the foul Face of *Occasional Conformity*, being an *Answer* to a late Poysonous Pamphlet, Entituled, *Moderation still a Vertue*. Price 1 s.
